

WAR AND PEACE
AIMS
OF
THE UNITED NATIONS



WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Massachusetts

Founded in 1910

Board of Trustees

GEORGE H. BLAKESLEE, *President*
FRANK AYDELOTTE
JAMES PHINNEY BAXTER, 3d
PERCY W. BIDWELL
HARVEY H. BUNDY
LEONARD W. CRONKHITE
STEPHEN DUGGAN
CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
BRUCE C. HOPPER
MANLEY O. HUDSON
WILLIAM K. JACKSON
JACOB J. KAPLAN
J. GRAFTON ROGERS
CHARLES SEYMOUR
KENNETH C. M. SILLS
PAYSON S. WILD
HENRY M. WRISTON

General Staff

LELAND M. GOODRICH, *Director*
MARIE J. CARROLL, *Chief,*
Reference Service
MARY J. MACDONALD, *Treasurer*

THE World Peace Foundation is a non-profit organization which was founded in 1910 by Edwin Ginn, the educational publisher, for the purpose of promoting peace, justice and good-will among nations. For many years the Foundation has sought to increase public understanding of international problems by an objective presentation of the facts of international relations. This purpose is accomplished principally through its publications and by the maintenance of a Reference Service which furnishes on request information on current international problems. Recently increased attention has been focused on American foreign relations by study groups organized for the consideration of actual problems of policy.

WAR and PEACE AIMS of THE UNITED NATIONS

September 1, 1939 — December 31, 1942

EDITED BY

LOUISE W. HOLBORN

Ph.D., Radcliffe College

INTRODUCTION BY

HAJO HOLBORN

Professor of ~~History~~ Yale University

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

BOSTON

1943

Copyright, 1943, by
World Peace Foundation

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FOREWORD

This collection of documents bearing on the war and peace aims of the United Nations has grown out of what was originally conceived, in December 1941, as a more modest enterprise, and in the course of growth has passed through numerous vicissitudes which have affected its final character.

The original purpose was to assemble a collection of statements on war and peace aims made by Allied Governments which might be made available in mimeographed form and on a limited basis to certain individuals and government agencies, both American and foreign, which had expressed an interest in and desire for such a compilation. With that end in view, at the suggestion of Dr. S. Shepard Jones, then Director of the Foundation, Professor Holborn agreed to commission one of his research workers at Yale University, Mrs. Edith Bracelin, to undertake, subject to his supervision, the making of such a compilation. While Mrs. Bracelin made a start in the collection of the materials, she was not able to finish the work, and the task of completing the collection and editing of the materials was assumed by Miss Louise Holborn.

With the passing of time, a new conception of the nature of the job to be done came to be accepted. Instead of making a highly selective compilation of statements to be issued in mimeographed form and on a restricted basis, it seemed desirable to undertake a more inclusive compilation of statements of war and peace aims with a view to showing not only what appeared to be the official views of governments but also the development of these views and something of the atmosphere of opinion prevailing in each country. In addition, with inevitable delays, it became necessary to extend the period to be covered.

Since the first announcement of this volume, there has appeared under the name of the United Nations Information Office a collection of *War and Peace Aims*¹ which might on the basis of title be regarded as doing in advance what this volume was intended to do. A careful examination

¹ Special Supplement No. 1 to *The United Nations Review*, January 30, 1943
United Nations Information Office, 610 Fifth Avenue, New York.

will, I think, show that these two collections are intended to serve quite distinct purposes and have quite distinct uses.

This volume has been the work of many hands and many minds. Though it may have suffered from that fact, it is hoped that it has benefited more. It is, in a sense, and subject to the qualifications noted above, a pioneer work and there are undoubtedly many respects in which it could be improved. I am sure that all who have had a hand in its preparation will welcome constructive suggestions to that end, in order that we may benefit from such suggestions if it is decided to publish a supplementary volume.

LELAND M. GOODRICH
Director

July 12, 1943

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	v
EDITOR'S NOTE	ix
INTRODUCTION	xi
I. THE UNITED NATIONS	1
1. JOINT DECLARATION	1
A. ATLANTIC CHARTER	2
2. DECLARATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, SEPTEMBER 3, 1939—DECEMBER 7, 1941	3
3. DECLARATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, DECEMBER 8, 1941—DECEMBER 31, 1942	7
II. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	15
1. FORMAL NEUTRALITY AND LIMITED NATIONAL EMERGENCY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1939—MAY 16, 1940	18
2. ACTIVE NATIONAL DEFENSE, MAY 16, 1940—MAY 27, 1941	26
3. UNLIMITED NATIONAL EMERGENCY, MAY 27, 1941—DECEMBER 8, 1941	40
4. STATE OF WAR, DECEMBER 8, 1941—DECEMBER 31, 1942	61
III. THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS	155
1. THE UNITED KINGDOM	155
A. THE CHAMBERLAIN GOVERNMENT, SEPTEMBER 1, 1939—MAY 9, 1940	157
B. THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT UNDER PRIME MINISTER WINSTON CHURCHILL	183
(1) From May 10, 1940 to the French Armistice with the Axis Powers, June 22, 1940	183
(2) From June 22, 1940 to the German Invasion of the Soviet Union, June 22, 1941	187
(3) From June 22, 1941 to the Japanese Attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941	207
(4) From Pearl Harbor to December 31, 1942	223
ANNEX: BRITISH DECLARATIONS REGARDING INDIA	278
2. THE DOMINIONS	301
A. CANADA	301
B. AUSTRALIA	315
C. NEW ZEALAND	326
D. UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	340
IV. UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	351
V. CHINA	378

	PAGE
VI. OCCUPIED COUNTRIES	404
1. CZECHOSLOVAKIA	404
2. POLAND	446
3. NORWAY	486
4. LUXEMBURG	501
5. THE NETHERLANDS	505
6. BELGIUM	523
7. GREECE	530
8. YUGOSLAVIA	547
9. COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES	557
ANNEX: FRANCE	559
A. THE FRENCH REPUBLIC — PRE-ARMISTICE STATEMENTS, SEP- TEMBER 3, 1939—JUNE 22, 1940	559
B. FIGHTING FRANCE	563
VII. THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS.	577
1. CONFERENCES	577
2. MEXICO	592
3. OTHER AMERICAN REPUBLICS	602
A. PANAMA	605
B. VENEZUELA	605
C. COLOMBIA	606
D. BRAZIL	606
E. URUGUAY	607
F. COSTA RICA	607
G. PERU	607
H. CUBA	608

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I. THE CHURCHES	610
1. THE VATICAN	610
2. THE UNITED STATES	627
3. GREAT BRITAIN	639
APPENDIX II. POLITICAL PARTIES	647
1. THE UNITED STATES	647
2. GREAT BRITAIN	668
BIBLIOGRAPHY	687
INDEX	697

EDITOR'S NOTE

The collection covers all countries which had signed the United Nations Declaration up to January 1943, certain American Republics that have severed relations with one or more of the Axis Powers, and Fighting France. Its organization aims at showing the development of the ideas of the individual countries on the subject of war and peace aims and also at giving a comprehensive picture of the characteristic outlook of each. While the presentation of material is chronological, a topical approach is facilitated by the provision of a subject index.

The material is drawn largely from statements and speeches by statesmen who hold responsible positions. In addition, agreements and treaties have been included which have a bearing on war and peace aims. Agreements and declarations concerning more than two countries have been placed in the United Nations section; those concerning only two countries appear in the sections of the respective countries. In excerpting documents, the intention has been to provide enough text to indicate the background and character of the whole statement.

Official texts have been used whenever it was possible to secure them, but for material of more recent date, this has frequently been difficult. For material originally published in a foreign language, the translations provided by official information offices have been used. The first reference under each document is to the text used, but other references to more easily accessible sources have also been included.

For assistance in securing texts, the editor would like to express appreciation to the Department of State, the Embassies of the Chinese Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Legations of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, the Mexican Department of Foreign Affairs, the British Information Services (formerly the British Library of Information), the Canadian Director of Public Information, and the Information Centers of the following countries: Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, Fighting France, Greece, Netherlands, Norway, Poland and Yugoslavia. The work has also been facilitated by the friendly cooperation of the staff of Wellesley College Library.

The editor wishes to express her indebtedness to Dr. S. Shepard Jones who was Director of the World Peace Foundation at the time this com-

pilation was undertaken and to Professor Leland M. Goodrich, the present Director, for their invaluable interest, encouragement and counsel. She also makes grateful acknowledgment of the helpful assistance of Miss Marie J. Carroll without whose long and painstaking effort the volume could not have been completed in its present form. Her thanks are also due to Mrs Ralph de Miranda for her careful preparation of the subject index

LOUISE W HOLBORN

Wellesley, Massachusetts

July 10, 1943

INTRODUCTION

This volume undertakes to record the growth of the war and peace aims of the United Nations in the forty months from the outbreak of war to the first anniversary of the Declaration of the United Nations on January 1, 1943. It is hoped that this collection of documents will be found useful by all students interested in the diplomacy of the war and of future peace. Most of the earlier collections have been limited to the declarations of single statesmen and governments, or paid little attention to the historical evolution of policy regarding war and peace aims.

In the preparation of this volume great care has been taken to present critical texts, and the friendly support lent by a great many diplomatic agencies of the United Nations enabled the editor to secure, in most instances, the official texts. It is superfluous to remind the reader that speeches by heads of governments, ministers of foreign affairs and their departmental subordinates, and heads or members of other administrative departments or agencies have quite different values as indications of governmental policy and often reflect different stages in the development of policy.

However, this work is concerned not only with the aims already generally accepted by the United Nations and with definitely adopted national policies, but also with the characteristic ideas and currents of thought which dominate the great debate on war and peace aims among the freedom-loving nations. For this reason, it has seemed useful to include in the Appendices some representative statements of leaders of political parties and the more significant pronouncements of the Christian churches which are likely to affect the development of policy in the future.

The documents contained in this volume tell the history of the growing unity of nations which went to war singly for the defense of their own national existence. There can be no doubt that war would not have engulfed the world if the nations now fighting a common war against the Axis Powers had maintained close and effective cooperation during the last twenty-five years. The disunity and mutual aloofness among the nations desirous of peace and security gave Japan, Germany and Italy their opportunities for the invasion and destruction of small and great nations alike.

However, it would be incorrect to ascribe the breakdown of international cooperation exclusively to preoccupation with ideas of national interest, the more so since even from a nationalistic point of view the diplomacy of the past has proved a dismal failure. The great ideological, social, and economic conflicts which followed in the wake of the first World War weakened not only the clear recognition of the forces of evil but confused the sane appraisal of the realities of international politics. No individual national state in our age is strong enough to resist aggression and international lawlessness. International cooperation, as is so clearly demonstrated on the far-flung battlefronts of the present war, is not an idealistic aberration, but the soundest realism.

This does not mean that national life will die. On the contrary the war has taught us again the intensity of national feelings. All countries arrayed against the Axis are fighting to maintain their national identities threatened by the specter of an all-embracing world empire. The war has resurrected deep-rooted loyalties to the national community and has helped to overcome social and economic conflicts which at times seemed to cripple the capacity for the achievement of national unity. Actually the desire for national isolation was often enough in the past the result of fear that international cooperation might intensify the domestic conflicts and necessitate social and political adjustments which appeared detrimental to the selfish interests of particular groups within the state. In other words, the conflict between national and international ideals was at no time merely a conflict between two concepts of national foreign policy, but served to a large extent as a cloak for an unwillingness to subordinate egotistical interests to the imperative demands of any communal life, national or international.

The war should have restored our sense of perspective. It has brought about a revival of the loyalties to common causes which transcend particular social groupings. At the same time the war has taught us that communal action cannot end at the borderlines of national states and national civilizations, but calls for the ultimate integration of all nations into a lawful international system. In view of this fresh desire for a general reform of the social and political forms of human association which the war has stirred up among all peoples, it is not surprising to see that the discussion of peace aims in the present war is not confined to the discussion of diplomatic issues, but is deeply concerned with problems which were formerly deemed the exclusive concern of sovereign national states. There is no longer in our age a clear distinction between internal and foreign politics and as a consequence it has become more difficult to define common international aims.

Another new aspect of the discussion of war and peace aims during the present war is the democratic method by which the United Nations try to achieve a solution. During the first World War the European

nations were tied together by secret diplomatic agreements and treaties and the evolution of a democratic program of peace was hampered by previous acts and commitments of governments. The American peace program, as expounded by Woodrow Wilson in 1917-19, was jeopardized from its inception by the necessity to compromise with the exigencies of the prearranged diplomatic situation. During the present war there is ground to believe that no secret diplomatic treaties have been concluded. The problem of war and peace aims has been left largely to public discussion. Only occasionally have governments tried to set up landmarks for the discussion by making diplomatic agreements which have at once been made public. We have embarked upon the most ambitious attempt ever undertaken to lay the foundation for future peace-making through free public discussion within and among the nations of the world.

This procedure implies heavy risks since the diversified attitudes and philosophies of more than thirty nations can easily crystallize into conflicting views. It is on the whole impressive to see how much unity exists in the vast chorus of voices heard. The general trend of the great debate, as displayed in this collection of documents, shows a very far-reaching agreement on the major principles of a desirable world order. However, the distinct interests and preoccupations of individual nations are bound to produce sharp contrasts in the application of these basic assumptions to the practical problems of future peace. It will be highly desirable to work with the greatest possible speed toward a precise and realistic agreement among the United Nations on the major political issues which will present themselves at the end of the present war.

It is often said that we should not think about concrete peace aims until we have defeated the Axis Powers in war, but such statements completely overlook the fact that a peace program is a political instrument which will contribute towards the winning of the war. This is true not only with respect to our present enemies whom we want to induce to throw off the chains of their present enslavement, but even more with regard to the strength and determination of the United Nations. Their power to strike will increase to the extent that their final aims are unified. Any doubt that the United Nations will not stand together in world affairs after the defeat of one or all of the Axis states will raise fears and will give the Axis an opportunity to try again its old game of "divide and conquer." The integration of the individual United Nations into one mighty block of powers depends to a large extent on our ability to translate whatever common ideals we have into a clear and practical vision of future international cooperation. This would at the same time doom all Axis schemes to raise mutual suspicion among the members of the present alliance.

The most intimate form of inter-Allied cooperation that exists at

present is to be found in the armed forces of the United Nations. This cooperation will, we hope, develop into a true comradeship in arms as the final stages of the war unfold. Behind it is an elaborate machinery for the planning and direction of the common war effort. This organization of the United Nations is by no means all-embracing and calls for both expansion and simplification.

It is often argued that the whole problem of future international cooperation can be solved beforehand by boldly setting up a comprehensive scheme of United Nations councils. They would serve as the nucleus of a future world system. However, this would demand a close understanding with regard to post-war problems of common interest, such as the treatment of enemy countries. Moreover, it is not altogether true that psychological and political adjustments will be produced by technical organization. The League of Nations did not collapse because it was imperfect, but chiefly because democratic governments failed to support it. A fully integrated organization of the United Nations Councils can only be accomplished if the nations are ready to place complete trust in unified representation. Such confidence can only spring from growing acquaintance and esteem which will develop in the course of joint fighting. In addition, the common effort for the solution of specific problems indispensable to the successful conduct of the war and the common planning of the post-war world will prepare the ground for the evolution of a concrete peace program of the United Nations.

At the present moment the nations fighting the Axis are diplomatically united by their common determination to conquer the forces of aggression. In the Joint Declaration of January 1, 1942, they have proclaimed their willingness to cooperate fully in the war "against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war." All of them have lived up to this promise and there is no reason to fear that the pledge to make no separate armistice or peace with the enemy will not be equally respected. However, little has been accomplished to implement the Atlantic Charter by a more detailed program of future international action. The Atlantic Charter has played a historic role in this war. Drafted at a moment when the fortunes of the free nations were low, its proud expression of faith in the capacity of democracy to deal with the political problems of our world in a constructive manner gave new courage and hope to the outnumbered defenders of democratic institutions. It served as a beacon light in dark days of military retreat. The documents contained in this volume show the influence which the Atlantic Charter exercised in rallying together the nations fighting the Axis oppression.

The Atlantic Charter will continue to give a dominant direction to all post-war planning, but we still have a long road to travel in the elaboration of a concrete program of peace and future world order. Arrange-

ments like those concluded between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union for a continued close cooperation after the war should go far to expedite the official negotiation of a more detailed peace program if all the United Nations could pledge themselves in a similar fashion. We may have to work towards such aims more slowly by negotiating bilateral rather than universal agreements, or by developing step by step a technical organization of the United Nations. It seems most likely that all these approaches will have to be used simultaneously as common setbacks and victories bring all the nations closer together.

This volume attempts to acquaint the reader with all these aspects and to allow him to choose his own position in the discussion. It tries at the same time to present a full picture of the individual reaction of each of the Allied nations to the problems of war and peace. The diversity of opinions among the United Nations is fortunately not only the result of differing interests but of unique experiences as well. The Allied nations have much to learn from each other and it is a gratifying experience to study the rich variety of ideas expressed in the many nations bent on winning a common war and a common peace.

Hajo Holborn

New Haven, Connecticut
July 9, 1943

I. THE UNITED NATIONS

1. JOINT DECLARATION

A Joint Declaration by United Nations, Washington, January 1, 1942, Signed by The United States of America, The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, Yugoslavia

The Governments signatory hereto,

Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Joint Declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, [see text below]

Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to decent life, liberty, independence and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world,

Declare

(1) Each Government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

(2) Each Government pledges itself to cooperate with the Governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

The foregoing declaration may be adhered to by other nations which are, or which may be, rendering material assistance and contributions in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism.

[Here follow signatures of the representatives of the 26 nations.¹]

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 3; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 203.

¹ Adherences to the Declaration: Mexico, June 5, 1942; the Philippines, June 10, 1942; Ethiopia, October 9, 1942; Iraq, January 16, 1943; Brazil, February 6, 1943.

Peru notified its "adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter," by telegram of February 8, 1943 (*D. S. Bul.*, VIII, p. 154)

A. Atlantic Charter

Declaration of Principles, Known as the Atlantic Charter, by the President of the United States (Roosevelt) and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom (Churchill) August 14, 1941

Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic adjustment and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air

Statement of January 5, 1942, by Department of State on Adherences to the Declaration: "In order that liberty-loving peoples silenced by military force may have an opportunity to support the principles of the Declaration by the United Nations, the Government of the United States as the depository for that Declaration will receive statements of adherence to its principles from appropriate authorities which are not governments." (*D. S. Bul.*, VI, p. 44.)

armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

United States, Executive Agreement Series 236, p. 4;
D. S. Bul., V, p. 125; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 209.

2. DECLARATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, SEPTEMBER 3, 1939— DECEMBER 7, 1941

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London:*¹ *Resolution, June 12, 1941*

The Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Government of Belgium, the Provisional Government of Czechoslovakia, the Governments of Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Yugoslavia, and the representatives of General de Gaulle, leader of Free Frenchmen, engaged together in the fight against aggression, are resolved:

1. That they will continue the struggle against German or Italian aggression until victory has been won and they will mutually assist each other in this struggle to the utmost of their respective capacities;

2. There can be no settled peace and prosperity so long as free peoples are coerced by violence into submission to domination by Germany or her associates or live under the threat of such coercion;

3. That the only true basis for enduring peace is the willing cooperation of the free peoples in a world in which, relieved of the menace of aggression, all may enjoy economic and social security; and that it is their intention to work together with other free peoples both in war and peace to this end.

U. K., Cmd. 6285, Misc. No. 1 (1941), p. 15; *D.A.F.R.*, III, p. 444; *I-A.R.*, 1941, I, 5, p. 1.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London:*¹ *Resolution regarding the Atlantic Charter, September 24, 1941*

The Governments of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, and the representatives of General de Gaulle, leader of Free Frenchmen,

¹ For statements made by representatives of the signatory countries see the respective sections.

4 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Having taken note of the Declaration recently drawn up by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill, on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom,

Now make known their adherence to the common principles of policy set forth in that Declaration and their intention to cooperate to the best of their ability in giving effect to them.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 6-7;
D.A.F.R., IV, p. 219.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London: Resolution regarding the Supply of Essential Requirements to Europe after the War, September 24, 1941

The Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa, the Governments of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics¹ and Yugoslavia, and the representatives of General de Gaulle, leader of Free Frenchmen, agree:

1. That it is their common aim to secure that supplies of food, raw materials, and articles of prime necessity should be made available for post-war needs of the countries liberated from Nazi oppression.

2. That, while each of the Allied Governments and authorities will be primarily responsible for making provision for the economic needs of its own peoples, their respective plans should be coordinated, in a spirit of inter-allied collaboration, for the successful achievement of the common aim.

3. That they welcome the preparatory measures which have already been undertaken for this purpose and express their readiness to collaborate to the fullest extent of their power in pursuing the action required.

4. That, accordingly, each of the Allied Governments and authorities should prepare estimates of the kinds and amounts of foodstuffs, raw materials, and articles of prime necessity required, and indicate the order of priority in which it would desire supplies to be delivered.

5. That the reprovisioning of Europe will require the most efficient employment after the war of the shipping resources controlled by each Government and of Allied resources as a whole, as well as of those belonging to other European countries, and that plans to this end should be worked out as soon as possible between the Allied Governments and authorities, in consultation, as and when appropriate, with other Governments concerned.

For reservations see section U.S.S.R., p. 358.

6. That, as a first step, a bureau should be established by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, with which the Allied Governments and authorities would collaborate in framing estimates of their requirements, and which, after collating and coordinating these estimates, would present proposals to a Committee of Allied representatives under the chairmanship of Sir Frederick Leith-Ross.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 17-18;
D.A.F.R., IV, p. 267.

Conference of the International Labor Organization,¹ New York, October 27—November 5, Washington, November 6, 1941: Resolutions

(1) RESOLUTION ON POST-WAR EMERGENCY AND RECONSTRUCTION
MEASURES, NOVEMBER 5, 1941

WHEREAS the victory of the free peoples in the war against totalitarian aggression is an indispensable condition of the attainment of the ideals of the International Labor Organization; and

WHEREAS the close of the war must be followed by immediate action, previously planned and arranged, for the feeding of peoples in need, for the reconstruction of the devastated countries, for the provision and transportation of raw materials and capital equipment necessary for the restoration of economic activity, for the reopening of trade outlets, for the resettlement of workers and their families under circumstances in which they can work in freedom and security and hope, for the changing over of industry to the needs of peace, for the maintenance of employment, and for the raising of standards of living throughout the world; and

WHEREAS the accomplishment of these purposes will require the "full-est collaboration between all nations in the economic field"; and

WHEREAS such collaboration will set tasks of organization and administration calling for the highest ability and for the most sympathetic understanding of the needs of peoples; and

WHEREAS the International Labor Organization, which possesses the confidence of the free peoples and includes in its structure the representatives of workers and employers, is for these reasons peculiarly fitted to take part in this work in such a way as to minimize misunderstanding and unrest and to promote a stable and enduring peace:

The Conference of the International Labor Organization

¹ The conference was attended by representatives of 35 countries, the majority of which had tripartite delegations.

6 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Requests the Governing Body:

(a) To transmit this resolution forthwith to the Governments of all Member States, to call their attention to the desirability of associating the International Labor Organization with the planning and application of measures of reconstruction, and to ask that the International Labor Organization be represented in any Peace or Reconstruction Conference following the war;

(b) To suggest to the Governments of the Member States that they should, if they have not already done so, set up representative agencies for the study of the social and economic needs of the post-war world and that such agencies should consult with the appropriate organs of the International Labor Organization;

(c) To set up from its own membership a small tripartite committee instructed to study and prepare (i) measures of reconstruction, (ii) measures to deal with unemployment, which should be empowered to enlist the assistance of technically qualified experts and authorized to cooperate with governmental, intergovernmental and private agencies engaged in similar studies and with those agencies whose present activities in the social and economic field affect the conditions under which post-war programs will be carried out;

(d) To make full use of such existing organs of the International Labor Organization as the International Public Works Committee, the Permanent Agricultural Committee, the Permanent Committee on Migration for Settlement, and the Joint Maritime Commission, and from time to time to make such modifications in the composition of these agencies, and to set up such new agencies, as may be needed to meet the responsibilities implied in this resolution;

(e) To direct the program of work of the International Labor Office to fulfil the purposes of this resolution; and

(f) To report on the subject matter of this resolution to the next and subsequent meetings of the International Labor Conference so that the International Labor Organization shall be in a position to give authoritative expression to the social objectives confided to it, in the rebuilding of a peaceful world upon the basis of "improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security."

(2) RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE ATLANTIC CHARTER, NOVEMBER 5, 1941

WHEREAS the Constitution of the International Labor Organization endorses the aforementioned principles of the Atlantic Charter, requests

that the fullest use be made of the machinery and experience of the International Labor Organization in giving effect to these principles, and pledges the full cooperation of the International Labor Organization in their implementation.

(3) RESOLUTION ON THE WAR AND PEACE, NOVEMBER 5, 1941

The Conference insists that, after having made sure of victory, the most important task for the democracies will be to establish the principles of economic cooperation which should be laid down between all the nations of the world; it is important that a start should be made immediately with the study of the economic conditions which will make social progress possible, so that, when victory has been won, the free nations will be ready to face the great task of reconstruction in order that the blessings of peace on earth and good will among men may become real and universal.¹

Conf. I.L.O., *Record of Proceedings*, 1941, New York and Washington, D.C., p. 163-4.

Joint Declaration by Delegates of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia, I. L. O. Conference, New York, November 5, 1941 (see p. 414).

3. DECLARATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, DECEMBER 8, 1941—
DECEMBER 31, 1942

Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, Adopted by Representatives of Nine Occupied Countries, London, January 13, 1942

Belgium, the Free French National Committee, Greece, Luxemburg, Poland, Norway, the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia were represented.² Mr. Anthony Eden opened the Conference, and the United States, the U.S.S.R., China, the British Dominions, and India sent observers.

WHEREAS Germany, since the beginning of the present conflict which arose out of her policy of aggression, has instituted in the occupied countries a regime of terror characterized in particular by imprisonments, mass expulsions, the execution of hostages and massacres; and

WHEREAS these acts of violence are being similarly perpetrated by the

¹ The Emergency Committee of the Governing Body of the International Labor Office meeting in London from April 20-24, 1942 took steps to develop a practical program in pursuance of these resolutions. For an account of that meeting, see *International Labour Review*, XLVI, p. 1, July 1942.

² For speeches made on the occasion by the representatives, see *I-A R.*, 1942, II, 2, p. 32-5.

8 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

allies and associates of the Reich and, in certain countries, by the accomplices of the occupying Power; and

WHEREAS international solidarity is necessary in order to avoid the repression of these acts of violence simply by acts of vengeance on the part of the general public, and in order to satisfy the sense of justice of the civilized world,

Recalling that international law, and in particular the Convention signed at The Hague in 1907 regarding the laws and customs of land warfare, do not permit belligerents in occupied countries to perpetrate acts of violence against civilians, to bring into disrepute the laws in force, or to overthrow national institutions,

The undersigned Representatives of: The Government of Belgium, the Government of Czechoslovakia, the Free French National Committee, the Government of Greece, the Government of Luxemburg, the Government of the Netherlands, the Government of Norway, the Government of Poland, the Government of Yugoslavia:

(1) Affirm that acts of violence thus perpetrated against the civilian populations are at variance with accepted ideas concerning acts of war and political offenses, as these are understood by civilized nations.

(2) Take note of the declaration made in this respect on October 25, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and by the British Prime Minister.¹

(3) Place amongst their principal war aims the punishment, through the channel of organized justice, of those guilty and responsible for these crimes, whether they have ordered them, perpetrated them, or in any way participated in them.

(4) Determine in a spirit of international solidarity to see to it that (a) those guilty and responsible, whatever their nationality, are sought for, handed over to justice and judged, (b) that the sentences pronounced are carried out.

Punishment for War Crimes. The Inter-Allied Declaration Signed at St. James's Palace, London, on 13th January, 1942. London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1942. 16 p.; D.A.F.R., IV, p. 663.

Joint Declaration of the General Steering Committee (Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia), Central and Eastern European Planning Board, New York, January 14, 1942

Our nations have suffered most during this war. The tyrannical order of Nazi Germany and satellites has tried with all possible means to enslave, politically and economically, the peoples of our states.

¹ See section The United Kingdom, p. 218 and section United States, p. 53.

This war is a war of the forces of Fascism and Nazism against the order and the principles of Democracy. We expect that the peace that will come will definitely do away with those forces of backwardness and darkness and secure to our nations, as well as to all the nations of the world, economic and social security and lasting international peace.

Our Allies' governments are working not only to win the war but also to win the peace. Both tasks are to be achieved in full cooperation and in harmony with all free nations.

The aims of our struggle and the outlines of our friendship were given in the Atlantic Charter, and the Joint Declaration of the twenty-six United Nations in Washington.

To prepare a better world the International Labor Conference held in New York unanimously accepted the resolution submitted by the U.S.A. delegation, i.e. governments', employers' and workers' delegates.

According to this resolution the International Labor Office shall organize a committee for post-war reconstruction.

The four Central and Eastern European states, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia, in connection with the U.S.A. resolution declared at this conference, on November 5, 1941, the intention of the closest cooperation in the struggle for freedom and in preparing post-war reconstruction.

To further this aim, the four delegations established on January 7, 1942, the Central and Eastern European Planning Board.

We agree on the essential need of close collaboration among peoples and governments of the small nations of Central and Eastern Europe, while war is still being fought, and later, after peace comes back to the world. The East European region has its own problems and those must be handled and solved by mutual consent and friendly collaboration of the respective nations. Doing so they believe that the democratic world of today and tomorrow will be enriched by a new sincere effort and by a constructive experiment in the way of the building of a better order.

The cooperation of all these nations constitutes a step towards the establishment of a future world order based on mutual friendship.

It is in that spirit that the idea of the Central and Eastern European Planning Board was conceived, and it is in that spirit that its founders want to see it work for the benefit of their peoples, their part of the world, and all democratic peoples.

Furthermore, we want to stress the unshaken belief in the victory of the cause of the United Nations, which is the cause of justice, de-

cency, and respect for the rights of individuals and nations, large and small alike. We also want to give expression to the special feelings of sympathy toward the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China, for their part in this struggle of today.

I-A R., 1942, II, 3, p. 42, *D.A.F R.*, IV, p. 271.

Agreement Between the Governments of the United States of America and of the United Kingdom¹ on the Principles Applying to Mutual Aid in the Prosecution of the War Against Aggression, Authorized and Provided for by the [Lend-Lease] Act of March 11, 1941,² Washington, February 23, 1942

WHEREAS the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare that they are engaged in a cooperative undertaking, together with every other nation or people of like mind, to the end of laying the bases of a just and enduring world peace securing order under law to themselves and all nations; and

WHEREAS the President of the United States of America has determined, pursuant to the Act of Congress of March 11, 1941, that the

¹ The so-called Master Agreement under the Lend-Lease Act. An indication of this agreement had already appeared in the press as early as November 18, 1941 (*N.Y.T.*), coinciding with the return of Mr. Attlee to London following his visit to the United States.

By January 1943 the following United Nations had signed Lend-Lease Master Agreements: February 23, United Kingdom; June 2, China; June 11, U.S.S.R.; June 16, Belgium; July 1, Poland; July 8, Netherlands; July 10, Greece; July 11, Czechoslovakia; July 11, Norway; July 24, Yugoslavia.

Specific reciprocal-aid agreements have been made which apply the principle of Article II of the Master Agreements to the particular problem of supplying our armed forces in the field (See Statement by Assistant Secretary Acheson, *Extension of the Lend-Lease Act*, *D. S. Bul.*, VIII, p. 188.) Reciprocal-aid agreements were executed with the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and the French National Committee, by exchanges of notes on September 3, 1942, with Belgium January 30, 1943 (for text see Edward R. Stettinius' *Report to the 78th Congress on Lend-Lease Operations from the Passage of the Act, March 11, 1941 to December 31, 1942*, H. Doc. 57, 78th Congress, p. 76). The agreements with the Governments of Australia and New Zealand also make applicable to their relations with the United States the principles of the Master Agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States of February 23, 1942. There are two other Lend-Lease agreements supplementing the Master Agreement with the United Kingdom with reference to patent questions and to the waiver of maritime claims

Canada agreed to the principles set forth in Article VII of the Master Agreement in an exchange of notes with the United States, November 30, 1942 (*D. S. Bul.*, VII, p. 977)

² "The Lend-Lease Act" An Act further to promote the Defense of the United States, and for Other Purposes (Public Law 11, 77th Cong; originated as H.R. 1776), see p. 34.

defense of the United Kingdom against aggression is vital to the defense of the United States of America; and

WHEREAS the United States of America has extended and is continuing to extend to the United Kingdom aid in resisting aggression; and

WHEREAS it is expedient that the final determination of the terms and conditions upon which the Government of the United Kingdom receives such aid and of the benefits to be received by the United States of America in return therefor should be deferred until the extent of the defense aid is known and until the progress of events makes clearer the final terms and conditions and benefits which will be in the mutual interests of the United States of America and the United Kingdom and will promote the establishment and maintenance of world peace; and

WHEREAS the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom are mutually desirous of concluding now a preliminary agreement in regard to the provision of defense aid and in regard to certain considerations which shall be taken into account in determining such terms and conditions and the making of such an agreement has been in all respects duly authorized, and all acts, conditions and formalities which it may have been necessary to perform, fulfill or execute prior to the making of such an agreement in conformity with the laws either of the United States of America or of the United Kingdom have been performed, fulfilled or executed as required;

The undersigned, being duly authorized by their respective Governments for that purpose, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I The Government of the United States of America will continue to supply the Government of the United Kingdom with such defense articles, defense services, and defense information as the President shall authorize to be transferred or provided.

ARTICLE II. The Government of the United Kingdom will continue to contribute to the defense of the United States of America and the strengthening thereof and will provide such articles, services, facilities or information as it may be in a position to supply.

ARTICLE III. The Government of the United Kingdom will not without the consent of the President of the United States of America transfer title to, or possession of, any defense article or defense information transferred to it under the Act or permit the use thereof by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the Government of the United Kingdom.

ARTICLE IV. If, as a result of the transfer to the Government of the United Kingdom of any defense article or defense information, it becomes necessary for that Government to take any action or make any payment in order fully to protect any of the rights of a citizen of the

United States of America who has patent rights in and to any such defense article or information, the Government of the United Kingdom will take such action or make such payment when requested to do so by the President of the United States of America.

ARTICLE V. The Government of the United Kingdom will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency, as determined by the President, such defense articles transferred under this Agreement as shall not have been destroyed, lost or consumed and as shall be determined by the President to be useful in the defense of the United States of America or of the Western Hemisphere or to be otherwise of use to the United States of America.

ARTICLE VI. In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the United Kingdom full cognizance shall be taken of all property, services, information, facilities, or other benefits or considerations provided by the Government of the United Kingdom subsequent to March 11, 1941, and accepted or acknowledged by the President on behalf of the United States of America.

ARTICLE VII. In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the United Kingdom in return for aid furnished under the Act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of worldwide economic relations. To that end, they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the United Kingdom, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the Joint Declaration made on August 12, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

At an early convenient date, conversations shall be begun between the two Governments with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded Governments.

ARTICLE VIII. This Agreement shall take effect as from this day's date. It shall continue in force until a date to be agreed upon by the two Governments.

Signed and sealed at Washington in duplicate this 23rd day of February, 1942

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL]

SUMNER WELLES

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

[SEAL]

HALIFAX

United States Executive Agreement Series 241;
U. K., Cmd. 6341, United States No. 1 (1942);
D. S. Bul., VI, p. 190-2; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 235.

Preamble of Draft Convention, Signed by the Governments of Argentina, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States of America following upon the Conclusion of the Wheat Discussions,¹ Washington, April 22, 1942

1. The prospects with regard to the production and marketing of wheat are such that accumulation of wheat surpluses threatens to result in grave post-war difficulties for the economies of the producing countries, and hence, because of the interdependence of nations, for the economies of all countries. It is also to be expected that, unless appropriate action is taken, such accumulation will recur.

2. A solution of the problem thus presented must be regarded as an essential part of any program of world economic reconstruction, and will call for cooperative action by all countries concerned in international trade in wheat. It will involve national and international measures for the regulation of wheat production in both exporting and importing countries, for the orderly distribution of wheat and flour in domestic and international trade at such prices as are fair to consumers and provide a reasonable remuneration to producers and for the maintenance of world supplies which shall be at all times ample for the needs of consumers without being so excessive as to create a world burden of unwanted surpluses.

3. Cooperative action is also necessary to meet the need for relief in the war-stricken areas of the world by the supply and distribution of gifts of wheat.

¹ See *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 713-18.

14 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

4. The benefits of abundant world supplies of wheat cannot be assured to consumers unless there is a substantial decrease in uneconomic incentives to high-cost production, a lowering of barriers to world trade and the charging of prices to consumers not substantially higher than the price of wheat in international trade.

5. In many countries the standard of living would be improved by increasing the consumption of wheat through a lowering of prices. In all countries the standard of living would be improved by stimulating the consumption of foods rich in vitamins, proteins and minerals. The increased production of such foods would offer a more valuable use for land which has at times been used uneconomically for high-cost production of wheat.

6. Producers of an international commodity such as wheat are directly affected by standards of living throughout the world, by international purchasing power and by prevailing policies and practices affecting international trade generally. There can be no basic solution of the problem of export surpluses without a general reduction of import barriers, and no measure should be taken or maintained which has the effect of retarding such reduction or of preventing in any way the fullest possible development of international trade.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 584; U. K., Cmd. 6371 (1942).

Declaration Condemning German Policy of Extermination of the Jewish Race, Washington and London, December 17, 1942

The attention of the Belgian, Czechoslovak, Greek, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Norwegian, Polish, Soviet, United Kingdom, United States and Yugoslav Governments and also of the French National Committee has been drawn to numerous reports from Europe that the German authorities, not content with denying to persons of Jewish race in all the territories over which their barbarous rule has been extended the most elementary human rights, are now carrying into effect Hitler's oft-repeated intention to exterminate the Jewish people in Europe. . . .

The above mentioned Governments and the French National Committee condemn in the strongest possible terms this bestial policy of cold-blooded extermination. They declare that such events can only strengthen the resolve of all freedom-loving peoples to overthrow the barbarous Hitlerite tyranny. They reaffirm their solemn resolution to ensure that those responsible for these crimes shall not escape retribution, and to press on with the necessary practical measures to this end.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 1009; *Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 385, 2083.

II. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

I. *Formal neutrality and limited national emergency*

1939

- Sept 3 President Roosevelt in radio address announced neutrality.
“ 5 Proclamation of neutrality.
Executive Order on passage and control of vessels through Panama Canal.
Proclamation on export of arms, ammunition and implements of war.
“ 8 President Roosevelt proclaimed a state of limited national emergency.
“ 21 Message of President to Congress on amendment of neutrality legislation.
Oct. 3 Declaration of Panama on zone of security in Western Hemisphere signed at Panama Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the American Republics.
Nov. 4 Neutrahty Act of 1939¹ approved by President Joint Resolution raising arms embargo but imposing cash-and-carry and war zone restrictions.

II. *Active national defense*

1940

- May 16 President Roosevelt's message to Congress on national defense.
Jun. 3 Joint resolution introduced declaring that the United States Government would not recognize transfer of any geographical region in the Western Hemisphere from one European power to another. Passed on June 18. A note in similar terms issued the same day by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. The resolution was made collective in the Act of Havana of July 30, 1940.
Aug. 18 Ogdensburg Agreement with Canada set up the Joint Permanent Board on Defense.
Sept. 2 Exchange of notes with Great Britain. Leases granted by Great Britain for air and naval bases in Newfoundland and Bermuda. Bases in the Caribbean leased by Great Britain in return for 50 destroyers
Nov. 5 Presidential election. Franklin D. Roosevelt returned to office.
“ 15 Proclamation of neutrality in the war between Italy and Greece.
Proclamation regarding use of ports or territorial waters of the U. S. by submarines of foreign belligerent states.
Dec. 17 President Roosevelt introduced idea of Lend-Lease.²

1941

- Jan. — American troops join Canadian forces in Newfoundland.
“ 21 Lifting of so-called moral embargo on exports to Soviet Union.

¹ U S Statutes at Large, vol. 54, pt 1, p 4.

² For chronology of Lend-Lease Act, see p. 17

16 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1941

- Mar. 11 Lend-Lease Act became law ¹
- “ 27 Agreement for the use and operation of naval and air bases with the United Kingdom signed at London
- Apr. 9 Agreement with Denmark in regard to Greenland.
- “ 10 Joint Resolution of the Congress reaffirming the Principles of the Monroe Doctrine.
- Proclamation regarding modification of combat area
- Proclamation of neutrality in war between Germany and Italy and Yugoslavia
- “ 15 Proclamation of neutrality in war between Hungary and Yugoslavia.
- “ 20 “Hyde Park Declaration.” Joint statement of President Roosevelt and Canadian Prime Minister Mackenzie King.
- “ 24 Proclamation of neutrality in war between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and Greece.

III. *Unlimited national emergency*

- May 27 Proclamation of unlimited national emergency.
- Jun. 5 Statement by Secretary of State Cordell Hull on policy on French possessions in the Western Hemisphere and relations with French Republic.²
- “ 17 Establishment of Joint Economic Committees with Canada.
- Jul. 1 Exchange of letters with Iceland respecting defense of Iceland.
- “ 7 American troops join British forces in Iceland. The British forces were subsequently withdrawn.
- “ 30 Recognition of Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile in London.
- Aug. 2 Exchange of notes with the U.S.S.R. respecting economic assistance
- “ 14 Declaration of Principles, known as The Atlantic Charter, made by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill.
- Oct. 28 Establishment of The Office of Lend-Lease Administration in the Office of Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President.
- Nov. 17 Joint resolution adopted to repeal sections 2, 3, and 6 of Neutrality Act of 1939 (Public Law No. 294, 77th Congress).
- “ 19 Agreements with Mexico.
- “ 24 Occupation of Surinam in agreement with the Netherlands and Brazil announced.

IV. *State of war*

- Dec. 7 Japan attacked Pearl Harbor and the Philippines.
- “ 8 Declaration of state of war with Japan.
- “ 11 Declaration of state of war with Germany and with Italy.

1942

- Jan. 26 Combined British American Boards on Raw Materials, Munitions Assignments and Shipping Adjustments established.
- Feb. 6 Combined Chiefs of Staff established between United States and Great Britain.
- “ 23 Mutual Aid Agreement with the United Kingdom.³

¹ For chronology of Lend-Lease Act, see p. 17.

² For text see *D. S. Bul.*, IV, p. 681.

³ For text of this Mutual Aid Agreement see p. 10, and for other master agreements see United States Executive Agreement Series No. 241, 251, 253, 254, 257, 259-263, 271-3.

1942

- Mar. 31 Defense agreement with Liberia.
- May 18 Agreement with Panama for use of defense areas by U. S. troops.
- Jun. 2 Mutual Aid Agreement with China.
- “ 2 Declaration of state of war with Bulgaria, Hungary and Rumania.
- “ 9 Creation of a Combined Production and Resources Board and a Combined Food Board with Great Britain.
- “ 11 Mutual Aid Agreement with the U.S.S.R.
- “ 16 Mutual Aid Agreement with Belgium.
- Jul 1 Mutual Aid Agreement with Poland
- “ 8 Mutual Aid Agreement with the Netherlands.
- “ 10 Mutual Aid Agreement with Greece.
- “ 11 Mutual Aid Agreement with Czechoslovakia.
- “ 11 Mutual Aid Agreement with Norway.
- “ 24 Mutual Aid Agreement with Yugoslavia.
- Sept 3 Exchange of notes with the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand on reciprocal lend-lease aid Adherence to the Agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States of Feb. 23, 1942, by Australia and New Zealand.
Exchange of notes on reciprocal lend-lease aid by the French National Committee signed at London.
- Oct. 9 Announcement that extraterritorial rights in China would be terminated by treaty with China.
- Nov. 30 Exchange of notes with Canada endorsing the principles set forth in Article VII of the Master Agreement with the United Kingdom pursuant to Lend-Lease Act of March 11, 1941.

Lend-Lease Act, March 11, 1941

1940

- Dec. 29 President Roosevelt in a radio address declared that America “must be the great arsenal of democracy.” (*Cong. Rec.*, Dec. 30, 1940, p. 21725.)

1941

- Jan. 10 The Lend-Lease Bill incorporating the President’s proposal was introduced in both Houses.
- Feb. 8 Bill was passed with amendments in the House. (*Cong. Rec.*, Feb. 8, 1941, p. 849.)
- Mar. 8 Bill was passed with amendments in the Senate. (*Cong. Rec.*, Mar. 8, 1941, p. 2144.)
- “ 11 House accepts Lend-Lease Bill as amended in Senate. (*Cong. Rec.*, Mar. 11, 1941, p. 2229.) Signed by the President, Public Law No 11, 77th Cong., 1st sess.
- Jun. 11 First Quarterly Report by the President to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations. S. Doc. 66, 77th Cong., 1st sess.
- Sept. 11 Second Quarterly Report, S. Doc. 112, 77th Cong., 1st sess.
- Oct. 28 Establishment of the Office of Lend-Lease Administration in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President. (*Fed. Reg.*, VI, Oct. 30, 1941, p. 5519.)
- Dec. 12 Third Quarterly Report, S. Doc. 149, 77th Cong., 1st sess.

1942

- Mar. 11 Fourth Quarterly Report, H. Doc. 661, 77th Cong., 2nd sess.
 Jun. 11 Fifth Quarterly Report, H. Doc. 799, 77th Cong., 2nd sess.
 Sept. 11 Sixth Quarterly Report, H. Doc. 839, 77th Cong., 2nd sess.
 Dec. 11 Seventh Quarterly Report, H. Doc. 904, 77th Cong., 2nd sess.

Report to the 78th Congress on Lend-Lease Operations: Letter from the Lend-Lease Administrator transmitting a report on the operations under the Lend-Lease Act, from the passage of the Act, March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1942. (H. Doc. 57, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) 91 p.

The following 43 nations have been declared eligible for Lend-Lease aid by the President: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fighting France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, South Africa, Turkey, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

1. FORMAL NEUTRALITY AND LIMITED NATIONAL EMERGENCY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1939—MAY 16, 1940

*Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Radio Address on Proclamation of
Neutrality, September 3, 1939*

.

And it seems to me clear, even at the outbreak of this great war, that the influence of America should be consistent in seeking for humanity a final peace which will eliminate, as far as it is possible to do so, the continued use of force between nations.

D. S. Bul., I, p. 201; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 3.

*Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message to Congress (Recommending
Revision of the Neutrality Law), September 21, 1939*

In such circumstances our policy must be to appreciate in the deepest sense the true American interest. Rightly considered, this interest is not selfish. Destiny first made us, with our sister nations on this Hemisphere, joint heirs of European culture. Fate seems now to compel us to assume the task of helping to maintain in the Western world a citadel wherein that civilization may be kept alive. The peace, the integrity, and the safety of the Americas — these must be kept firm and serene. . . .

Development of United States Foreign Policy. Addresses and Messages of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Intended to Present the Chronological Development of the Foreign Policy of the United States from the Announcement of the Good Neighbor Policy in 1933, Including the War Declarations. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1942. Senate Doc. No. 188, 77th Cong., 2d sess., hereinafter cited as S. Doc. No. 188, 77th Cong., 2d sess.; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 11.

George S. Messersmith, Assistant Secretary of State: Address before the Governors' Session of the Fifteenth New England Conference, Boston, November 23, 1939

. . . I summarize briefly what I regard as the cardinal points of our American foreign policy at the close of this year, 1939.¹

- (1) It is the earnest desire of our Government to remain at peace;
- (2) It is our hope that peace will be restored on other continents;
- (3) While war is in progress we are determined, in collaboration with the other governments, to keep the Western Hemisphere neutral and free of warlike activities and to give in our relations with the other American Republics practical effect, no less than in peacetime, to the "good neighbor" policy;
- (4) Where, and when, practicable we shall seek to promote a sound and healthy reconstruction of international economic relationships;
- (5) With strict regard to American interests, we shall seek to assist, by every practicable means, in the establishment of conditions which will assure stable peace;

¹ Compare statement of Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, on American foreign policy, Washington, July 16, 1937, issued shortly after the outbreak of the hostilities in the Far East in answer to the Chinese National Government's memorandum setting forth "the status and circumstances of the present threat by Japan in North China" which the United States Government received as a signatory of the Nine-Power Treaty guaranteeing the territorial sovereignty of China. The fundamental principles are given as follows:

"This country constantly and consistently advocates maintenance of peace. We advocate national and international self-restraint. We advocate abstinence by all nations from use of force in pursuit of policy and from interference in the internal affairs of other nations. We advocate adjustment of problems in international relations by processes of peaceful negotiation and agreement. We advocate faithful observance of international agreements. Upholding the principle of the sanctity of treaties, we believe in modification of provisions of treaties, when need therefore arises, by orderly processes carried out in a spirit of mutual helpfulness and accommodation. We believe in respect by all nations for the rights of others and performance by all nations of established obligations. We stand for revitalizing and strengthening of international law. We advocate steps toward promotion of economic security and stability the world over. We advocate lowering or removing of excessive barriers in international trade. We seek effective equality of commercial opportunity and we urge upon all nations application of the principle of equality of treatment. We believe in limitation and reduction of armament. Realizing the necessity for maintaining armed forces adequate for national security, we are prepared to reduce or to increase our own armed forces in proportion to reductions or increases made by other countries. We avoid entering into alliances or entangling commitments but we believe in cooperative effort by peaceful and practicable means in support of the principles hereinbefore stated." (*Fundamental Principles of International Policy* . . . , D. S. Publication No. 1079; *D. A. F. R.*, I, p. 3-4.)

See also President Roosevelt's address at Chicago on October 5, 1937 (White House release).

(6) We stand ready to discuss with other nations having interests in the Far East, in accordance with treaty provisions and by due processes of international law, the situation in that part of the world;

(7) We are ready to discuss with other nations the problem of limitation of armaments by international agreement.

In a word, we urge a return to liberal international practices and to those standards of justice, fair dealing, good faith, and order under law which offer the only reliable foundations for enduring peace among nations, and we are prepared to assist toward return to and improvement of such practices and standards.

D. S. Bul, I, p. 579.

*Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Letter to Pope Pius XII, December 23, 1939*¹

... I believe that while statesmen are considering a new order of things, the new order may well be at hand. I believe that it is even now being built, silently but inevitably, in the hearts of masses whose voices are not heard, but whose common faith will write the final history of our time. They know that unless there is belief in some guiding principle and some trust in a divine plan, nations are without light, and peoples perish. They know that the civilization handed down to us by our fathers was built by men and women who knew in their hearts that all were brothers because they were children of God. They believe that by His will enmities can be healed; that in His mercy the weak can find deliverance, and the strong can find grace in helping the weak.

In the grief and terror of the hour, these quiet voices, if they can be heard, may yet tell of the rebuilding of the world.

It is well that the world should think of this at Christmas.

Because the people of this nation have come to a realization that time and distance no longer exist in the older sense, they understand that that which harms one segment of humanity harms all the rest. They know that only by friendly association between the seekers of light and the seekers of peace everywhere can the forces of evil be overcome.

In these present moments, no spiritual leader, no civil leader can move forward on a specific plan to terminate destruction and build anew. Yet the time for that will surely come.

It is, therefore, my thought that though no given action or given time may now be prophesied, it is well that we encourage a closer association between those in every part of the world — those in religion and those in government — who have a common purpose.

¹ For Pope Pius' answer see section Vatican, p. 614

I am, therefore, suggesting to Your Holiness that it would give me great satisfaction to send to you my personal representative in order that our parallel endeavors for peace and the alleviation of suffering may be assisted.

When the time shall come for the re-establishment of world peace on a surer foundation, it is of the utmost importance to humanity and to religion that common ideals shall have united expression.

Furthermore, when that happy day shall dawn, great problems of practical import will face us all. Millions of people of all races, all nationalities and all religions may seek new lives by migration to other lands or by reestablishment of old homes. Here, too, common ideals call for parallel action.

I trust, therefore, that all of the churches of the world which believe in a common God will throw the great weight of their influence into this great cause. . . .

D. S. Bul., I, p. 712; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 367.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Annual Message Delivered before a Joint Session of the Two Houses of Congress on the State of the Nation, January 3, 1940

We must look ahead and see the possibilities for our children if the rest of the world comes to be dominated by concentrated force alone — even though today we are a very great and a very powerful nation.

We must look ahead and see the effect on our own future if all the small nations throughout the world have their independence snatched from them or become mere appendages to relatively vast and powerful military systems.

We must look ahead and see the kind of lives our children would have to lead if a large part of the rest of the world were compelled to worship the god imposed by a military ruler, or were forbidden to worship God at all; if the rest of the world were forbidden to read and hear the facts — the daily news of their own and other nations — if they were deprived of the truth that makes men free.

We must look ahead and see the effect on our future generations if world trade is controlled by any nation or group of nations which sets up that control through military force.

It is, of course, true that the record of past centuries includes destruction of small nations, enslavement of peoples, and building of empires on the foundation of force. But wholly apart from the greater international morality which we seek today, we recognize the practical fact

that with modern weapons and modern conditions, modern man can no longer live a civilized life if we are to go back to the practice of wars and conquests of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

.

Of course, the peoples of other nations have the right to choose their own form of government. But we in this Nation still believe that such choice should be predicated on certain freedoms which we think are essential everywhere. We know that we ourselves will never be wholly safe at home unless other governments recognize such freedoms.

.

For many years after the World War blind economic selfishness in most countries, including our own, resulted in a destructive mine field of trade restrictions which blocked the channels of commerce among nations. This policy was one of the contributing causes of existing wars. It dammed up vast unsaleable surpluses, helping to bring about unemployment and suffering in the United States and everywhere else

To point the way to break up the log jam, our Trade Agreements Act ¹ was passed — based upon a policy of equality of treatment among nations and of mutually profitable arrangements of trade.

.

. . . the Trade Agreements Act should be extended as an indispensable part of the foundation of any stable and durable peace.

The old conditions of world trade made for no enduring peace; and when the time comes the United States must use its influence to open up the trade channels of the world in order that no nation need feel compelled in later days to seek by force of arms what it can well gain by peaceful conference. For this purpose we need the Trade Agreements Act even more than when it was passed.

I emphasize the leadership which this Nation can take when the time comes for a renewal of world peace. Such an influence will be greatly weakened if this Government becomes a dog in the manger of trade selfishness.

.

H. Doc. 528, 76th Cong., 3d sess.; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 36-8.

¹ See also Mr. Hull's speech at the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, December 5, 1939 (*D. S. Bul.*, I, p. 664).

*Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Statement before the House Ways and Means Committee on the Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, January 11, 1940*¹

. . . our Nation, and every nation, can enjoy sustained prosperity only in a world which is at peace. . . . a peaceful world is possible only when there exists for it a solid economic foundation, an indispensable part of which is active and mutually beneficial trade among the nations. The creation of such a foundation is the second of the two primary objectives of the trade-agreements program, which seeks the advancement of our domestic prosperity and the promotion of world peace.

The establishment of sound international trade relations will be an essential problem of post-war reconstruction. What role will our country play in this process?

D. S. Bul., II, p. 37.

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State: Address on "America's Post-War Problems" to the Yale Political Union, New Haven, January 31, 1940

. . . Much of the old world is today engaged in war; and this war will end. . . .

When orders are finally given to ground arms on all fronts, you are likely to find that practically every avenue of international trade is blocked. Old and normal traffic on which we relied to keep business going and national life on an even keel will have dried up. Great areas in Europe will be in grave physical distress. In some places many of the accepted comforts of modern life will have ceased to be available; but in other areas, populations will be literally starving, naked, and perhaps homeless. . . .

There will be no clear guideposts to reconstruction. The newer forms of government which claimed to be revolutionary will have failed quite as signally as they insist the older forms of government did which they sought to overthrow. You will find great masses of men, without illusions, seeking and struggling for an idea of life which gives them hope; for an organization of peace which lets them work toward that end; and for a freedom of life which permits them to walk in the land of the living without fear.

¹ See also Secretary Hull's radio address, Washington, May 19, 1940 in observance of National Foreign Trade Week (*D. S. Bul.*, II, p. 571) and Vice President Wallace's statement, January 12, 1940 (Cong., H. R., Committee on Ways and Means, *Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act*, Hearings, 76th Cong., 3d sess., on H. J. Res. 407 . . . January 11-February 3, 1940. 3 vols.).

And what of the United States? . . .

Its strength will be that we shall, I think, offer the world a tremendous picture of the possibilities of peaceful life. Races and groups which lived in perpetual hatred in Europe have sent millions of their sons to the United States where they live side by side in peace and friendship. In the Western Hemisphere, in the main, we have been able to keep peace without standing armies, fortified frontiers, perpetual diplomatic juggles of the balance of power, or insistence on revolution as the only solution of social problems. . . .

You will thus face, in your own experience, and in the not too distant future, the staggering problems of peace and reorganization.

It will then appear, I think, that the present war has a double aspect. Undeniably this is a struggle between certain groups of nations. Beneath that, there is a desperate search throughout Europe to find the basis for a new way of life. . . .

Now if we are to navigate safely the period which must inevitably follow this war, we shall need clear heads and sound instincts.

. . . I think that with clear vision, and using the highest guide of our instincts, we shall say that as a matter of course we must contribute to the reconstruction of an ordered world as rapidly as possible. We have rejected any intent to do so by war. But we have not declined to assert peace, if peace can be soundly based.

D. S. Bul., II, p. 139; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 42.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Broadcast in Connection with Christian Foreign Service Convocation, March 16, 1940

Today we seek a moral basis for peace. It cannot be a real peace if it fails to recognize brotherhood. It cannot be a lasting peace if the fruit of it is oppression, or starvation, or cruelty, or human life dominated by armed camps. It cannot be a sound peace if small nations must live in fear of powerful neighbors. It cannot be a moral peace if freedom from invasion is sold for tribute. It cannot be an intelligent peace if it denies free passage to that knowledge of those ideals which permit men to find common ground. It cannot be a righteous peace if worship of God is denied.

D. S. Bul., II, p. 345-6; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 49.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Address to the Governing Board of the Pan American Union, Washington, April 14, 1940

. . . Peace among our American nations remains secure because of the instruments we have succeeded in creating. They embody, in great

measure at least, the principles upon which, I believe, enduring peace must be based throughout the world.

Peace reigns today in the Western Hemisphere because our nations have liberated themselves from fear. No nation is truly at peace if it lives under the shadow of coercion or invasion. By the simple process of agreeing that each nation shall respect the integrity and independence of the others, the New World has freed itself of the greatest and simplest cause of war. Self-restraint and the acceptance of the equal rights of our neighbors as an act of effective will has given us the peace we have had, and will preserve that peace so long as we abide by this ultimate moral law.

Peace reigns among us today because we have agreed, as neighbors should, to mind our own businesses. We have renounced, each and all of us, any right to intervene in each other's domestic affairs, recognizing that free and independent nations must shape their own destinies and find their own ways of life.

Peace reigns among us today because we have resolved to settle any dispute that should arise among us by friendly negotiation in accordance with justice and equity, rather than by force. We have created effective machinery for this purpose and we have demonstrated our willingness to have full recourse to that method.

Peace reigns among us because we have recognized the principle that only through vigorous and mutually beneficial international economic relations can each of us have adequate access to materials and opportunities necessary to a rising level of economic well-being for our peoples. In every practicable way we are seeking to bring this vital principle to its realization.

D. S. Bul., II, p. 404-5; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 167.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Address at the Opening of the Eighth American Scientific Congress, Washington, May 10, 1940

. . . I am a pacifist. You, my fellow citizens of 21 American republics, are pacifists.

But I believe that by overwhelming majorities you and I, in the long run and if it be necessary, will act together to protect and defend by every means our science, our culture, our freedom, and our civilization.

D. S. Bul., II, p. 496.

2. ACTIVE NATIONAL DEFENSE, MAY 16, 1940—MAY 27, 1941

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message on National Defense to the Congress, May 16, 1940

Our ideal, our objective is still peace — peace at home and peace abroad. Nevertheless, we stand ready not only to spend millions for defense but to give our service and even our lives for the maintenance of our American liberties.

Our security is not a matter of weapons alone. The arm that wields them must be strong, the eye that guides them clear, the will that directs them indomitable

These are the characteristics of a free people, a people devoted to the institutions they themselves have built, a people willing to defend a way of life that is precious to them all, a people who put their faith in God.

D. S. Bul., II, p. 523; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 62.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message¹ on Foreign Trade Policy (Foreign Trade Week), Washington, May 19, 1940

. . . vigorous and mutually beneficial trade relations among nations are essential for the maintenance of enduring world peace.

The tragic events now transpiring bear eloquent testimony to the fundamental need for liberal economic policies in international relations, if, in the future, frictions, conflicts, and wars among nations are to be averted. . . .

The promotion of liberal economic policies has been — and will continue to be — a vital part and a dominant purpose of the foreign policy of the United States. . . .

D. S. Bul., II, p. 571; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 62-3.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Address at Harvard University, Cambridge, June 20, 1940

We, Americans of today, have behind us a century and a half of national existence, to which we point, with justifiable pride, as a successful experiment in democracy and human freedom. That experiment began with a resplendent generation of Americans resolved to stake on its success their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

¹ Read by Secretary of State Hull as part of his radio address, May 19, 1940

With unshakable faith in their cause and an unswerving determination to make it prevail, they risked their all for the creation of a nation in which each citizen would have — as his inalienable rights — liberty under law, equality of opportunity, freedom of thought and of conscience.

Those Americans believed unreservedly that in a nation founded upon these great principles the people could enjoy individually a far greater measure of well-being and happiness than is possible under any other form of political and social organization and could achieve collectively a degree of internal strength and unity of purpose necessary to insure for the Nation itself the inalienable right to manage its own affairs solely by the will of its own people.

.

Our American history has not been achieved in isolation from the rest of mankind; there is no more dangerous folly than to think that its achievements can be preserved in isolation.

It has been a part of a vast movement — in the Old World as well as the New — which has opened new vistas in the destiny of man; which has carried human progress to new and exalted heights; which has, through scientific attainment, lessened the tyranny over man of the blind forces of nature; which, as never before, has expanded for the human race as a whole the opportunity for freedom of mind and of spirit.

To this great stream of new ideas, new attainments, new cultural values, we have made our contribution; and we ourselves, in turn, have been nourished by it.

The massed forces of lust for tyrannical power are directed today against the very bases of the way of life which has come to be the cherished ideal of a preponderant majority of mankind — against the moral, spiritual, social, political and economic foundations of modern civilization.

Nation after nation has been crushed into surrender, overrun and enslaved by the exercise of brute forces combined with fraud and guile.

And as the dismal darkness descends upon more and more of the earth's surface, as its menacing shadow falls blacker and blacker athwart our continent, the very instinct of self-preservation bids us beware.

We have the power to meet that menace successfully, if we, at the time, face the task which is before us in the same spirit in which former generations of Americans met the crises that confronted them in their times.

We need material means of defense. These means we are determined to create, and we are creating them. But more than that is needed.

Men will defend to the utmost only things in which they have complete faith. Those who took part in the struggle by which freedom was won for this Nation would have found its hardships unbearable if they had not been imbued with transcendent faith in the things for which they fought

The task of preserving and defending freedom requires at times as stern and determined a struggle as the task of achieving freedom, and as firm a faith.

No more vital test has ever confronted the American people than that which confronts it today. There are difficult and dangerous times ahead. Our national independence and our cherished institutions are not immune from the challenge of the lust for power that already stalks so much of the earth's surface.

Unprecedented effort and heavy sacrifices will be required of us as the price of preserving, for ourselves and for our posterity, the kind of America that has been fostered and preserved for us by the vigilance, courage and sacrifice of those who preceded us.

We shall succeed if we retain unimpaired the most precious heritage which they bequeathed to us — unshakable faith in the everlasting worth of freedom and honor, of truth and justice, of intellectual and spiritual integrity; and an immutable determination to give our all, if need be, for the preservation of our way of life.

Without that faith and that determination, no material means of defense will suffice. With them, we need fear no enemy outside or within our borders.

In times of grave crises there are always some who fall a prey to doubt and unreasoning fear; some who seek refuge in cynicism and narrow self-interest; some who wrap themselves in the treacherous cloak of complacency. All these are dangers that lie within us. All these impair the faith and weaken the determination without which freedom cannot prevail.

Each and every one of us must search his mind and his heart for these signs of fatal weakness. The stern realities of the crisis which is upon us call, as never before, for vision and for loyalty. They call for all the strength of hand, of mind and of spirit that we can muster. They call for self-reliance, for self-restraint, for self-imposed and freely accepted discipline.

They call for the kind of national unity that can be achieved only by free men, invincible in their resolve that human freedom must not perish. They call for unselfish service today if we are to win through to a secure and bright tomorrow.

A responsibility seldom equalled in gravity and danger rests upon each and every one of us. Neglect or delay in assuming it, willingly and fully, would place in mortal danger our way of life and the sacred cause of human freedom.

Were we to fail in that responsibility, we would fail ourselves; we would fail the generations that went before us; we would fail the generations that are to come after us; we would fail mankind; we would fail God.

I am supremely confident that we shall not fail. I am certain that in the minds and hearts of our people still — still — lie welling springs — inexhaustible and indestructible — of faith in the things we cherish, of courage and determination to defend them, of sacrificial devotion, of unbreakable unity of purpose.

I am certain that, however great the hardships and the trials which loom ahead, our America will endure and the cause of human freedom will triumph.

D. S. Bul., II, p. 683; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 83.

The Ogdensburg Agreement: Joint Statement of the President of the United States (Roosevelt) and the Prime Minister of Canada (Mackenzie King) Setting Up the Permanent Joint Board on Defense, Ogdensburg, New York, August 17, 1940

The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defense in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a Permanent Joint Board on Defense shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This Permanent Joint Board on Defense shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and matériel.

It will consider in the broad sense the defense of the north half of the Western Hemisphere.

The Permanent Joint Board on Defense will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly.

D. S. Bul., III, p. 154; *D.A.F.R.*, III, p. 160.

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State: Address on "Our Foreign Policy and National Defense" to the Foreign Affairs Council, Cleveland, September 28, 1940

.

Believing, as this Government does, that one of the surest safeguards against war is the opportunity of all peoples to buy and to sell on equal

terms and without let or hindrance of a political character, we have never ceased to offer our full participation and cooperation in such a general economic program.

The oncoming of the war and the complete dislocation of international trade have necessarily left the program in suspense, but the determination of your Government to resume it when the opportunity again occurs remains unaltered.

.

While your Government must continue in the future, as it has in the past, to prepare for all eventualities, this Nation must at the same time be ready, when the time comes, to aid in the construction of that kind of a world peace based on justice and on law through which alone can our security be fully guaranteed.

.

D. S. Bul., III, p. 245, 250.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Radio Address to the Peoples of the Western Hemisphere, Dayton, Ohio, October 12, 1940¹

The core of our defense is the faith we have in the institutions we defend. The Americas will not be scared or threatened into the ways the dictators want us to follow.

No combination of dictator countries of Europe and Asia will halt us in the path we see ahead for ourselves and for democracy.

No combination of dictator countries of Europe and Asia will stop the help we are giving to almost the last free people fighting to hold them at bay.

Our course is clear. Our decision is made. We will continue to pile up our defense and our armaments. We will continue to help those who resist aggression, and who now hold the aggressors far from our shores. Let no American in any part of the Americas question the possibility of danger from overseas. Why should we accept assurances that we are immune? History records that not long ago those same assurances were given to the people of Holland and Belgium and Norway.

It can no longer be disputed that forces of evil which are bent on conquest of the world will destroy whomever and whenever they can destroy. We have learned the lessons of recent years. We know that if we seek to appease them by withholding aid from those who stand in their way, we only hasten the day of their attack upon us.

¹ Delivered from the President's train and transmitted by long- and short-wave over national and world hookups in English, French, Italian and Spanish.

The people of the United States, the people of all the Americas, reject the doctrine of appeasement. They recognize it for what it is — a major weapon of the aggressor nations.

I speak bluntly. I speak the love the American people have for freedom and liberty and decency and humanity.

That is why we arm. Because, I repeat, this nation wants to keep war away from these two continents. Because we all of us are determined to do everything possible to maintain peace on this hemisphere. Because great strength of arms is the practical way of fulfilling our hopes for peace and for staying out of this war or any other war. Because we are determined to muster all our strength so that we may remain free.

D. S. Bul., III, p. 294; *D.A.F.R.*, III, p. 9.

***Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Address on "Our Foreign Policy"
Delivered at the National Press Club Dinner, Washington, October 26, 1940***

The United States, together with most other nations, has stood firmly for the basic principles underlying civilized international relations — peace, law, justice, treaty observance, non-intervention, peaceful settlement of differences, and fair-dealing, supported by the fullest practicable measure of international cooperation. The advocacy of these principles has won for us the friendship of all nations, except those which, vaguely describing themselves as the "have-nots" and claiming a superior right to rule over other peoples, are today on the march with great armies, air-fleets, and navies to take by force what they say they need or want.

The first need for all nations still masters of their own destiny is to create for themselves, as speedily and as completely as possible, impregnable means of defense. This is the staggering lesson of mankind's recent experience.

We are taking measures toward dealing with subversive activities in this country directed from abroad. . . .

We are seeking to advance by every appropriate means the spirit of inter-American solidarity and the system of continental defense. . . .

We have concluded an arrangement¹ with Great Britain under which

¹ See section United Kingdom, p. 189.

we have acquired long-time leases of eight strategically located naval and air bases which will enable us to create a protective girdle of steel along the Atlantic seaboard of the American Continent — bases which will be available for use by all of the American Republics. We are engaged in defense consultations with our neighbors to the south, and we have created facilities for such consultations with Canada. In all these fields, we intend to continue vigorous effort.

We have sought in every appropriate way to discourage conquest and to limit the area of war. We have followed consistently the policy of refusing recognition of territorial changes effected by force or threat of force. We have taken every opportunity to express our concern over threatened changes by force in the existing political status of colonial possessions, disturbance of which would extend the area of hostilities. We have placed under license the funds of invaded countries. In these respects, too, we intend to continue our activities.

We believe that the safety and the primary interests of the United States must be upheld with firmness and resolution — supported by the speediest and fullest possible armament for all defensive purposes. In view of the unprecedented character of menacing developments abroad, we have frankly recognized the danger involved and the increasing need for defense against it. As an important means of strengthening our own defense and of preventing attack on any part of the Western Hemisphere, this country is affording all feasible facilities for the obtaining of supplies by nations which, while defending themselves against barbaric attack, are checking the spread of violence and are thus reducing the danger to us. We intend to continue doing this to the greatest practicable extent. Any contention, no matter from what source, that this country should not take such action is equivalent, in the present circumstances to a denying of the inalienable right of self-defense.

In our democracy the basic determination of foreign policy rests with the people. As I sense the will of our people today, this Nation is determined that its security and rightful interests shall be safeguarded.

The people of this country want peace. To have peace, we must have security. To have security, we must be strong. These are times that test the fiber of men and of nations.

.

. . . We must hold to the ideal of a world in which the rights of all nations are respected and each respects the rights of all; in which principles of law and order and justice and fair-dealing prevail. Above all, we

must be a united people — united in purpose and in effort to create impregnable defense.

Thus can we maintain our inheritance. Thus will we continue to make this country's high contribution toward the progress of mankind on the roadway of civilized effort.

D. S. Bul, III, p. 331, *D.A.F.R.*, III, p. 11-15

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Nation, January 6, 1941

.

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression — everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way — everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want — which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants — everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear — which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor — anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb.

To that new order we oppose the greater conception — the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear.

Since the beginning of our American history we have been engaged in change — in a perpetual and peaceful revolution — a revolution which goes on steadily, quietly adjusting itself to changing conditions — without the concentration camp or the quick-lime in the ditch. The world order which we seek is the cooperation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilized society.

This nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the

guidance of God Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them. Our strength is in our unity of purpose

To that high concept there can be no end save victory

H. Doc , No 1, 77th Cong , 1st sess., *D A F R.*, III, p. 33-4.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Statement before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, January 15, 1941

. . . in the conduct of our foreign relations, this Government has directed its efforts to the following objectives: (1) Peace and security for the United States with advocacy of peace and limitation and reduction of armament as universal international objectives; (2) support for law, order, justice, and morality and the principle of non-intervention; (3) restoration and cultivation of sound economic methods and relations, based on equality of treatment; (4) development, in the promotion of these objectives, of the fullest practicable measure of international co-operation; (5) promotion of the security, solidarity, and general welfare of the Western Hemisphere . . .

D. S. Bul., IV, p. 85.

Lend-Lease Act, Approved March 11, 1941

Further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "An Act to Promote the Defense of the United States."

SECTION 2.

As used in this Act —

(a) The term "defense article" means —

- (1) Any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;
- (2) Any machinery, facility, tool, material, or supply necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repair, servicing, or operation of any article described in this subsection;
- (3) Any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in this subsection;
- (4) Any agricultural, industrial or other commodity or article for defense.

Such term "defense article" includes any article described in this subsection manufactured or procured pursuant to section 3, or to which the

United States or any foreign government has or hereafter acquires title, possession, or control

(b) The term "defense information" means any plan, specification, design, prototype, or information pertaining to any defense article.

SECTION 3.

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may, from time to time, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the Government —

(1) To manufacture in arsenals, factories, and shipyards under their jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, to the extent to which funds are made available therefor, or contracts are authorized from time to time by the Congress, or both, any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

(2) To sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to any such government any defense article, but no defense article not manufactured or procured under paragraph (1) shall in any way be disposed of under this paragraph, except after consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, or both. The value of defense articles disposed of in any way under authority of this paragraph, and procured from funds heretofore appropriated, shall not exceed \$1,300,000,000. The value of such defense articles shall be determined by the head of the department or agency concerned or such other department, agency or officer as shall be designated in the manner provided in the rules and regulations issued hereunder. Defense articles procured from funds hereafter appropriated to any department or agency of the Government, other than from funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act, shall not be disposed of in any way under authority of this paragraph except to the extent hereafter authorized by the Congress in the Acts appropriating such funds or otherwise.

(3) To test, inspect, prove, repair, outfit, recondition, or otherwise to place in good working order, to the extent to which funds are made available therefor, or contracts are authorized from time to time by the Congress or both, any defense article for any such government, or to procure any or all such services by private contract.

(4) To communicate to any such government any defense information, pertaining to any defense article furnished to such government under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

36 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(5) To release for export any defense article disposed of in any way under this subsection to any such government

(b) The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory

(c) After June 30, 1943, or after the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses before June 30, 1943, which declares that the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a) are no longer necessary to promote the defense of the United States, neither the President nor the head of any department or agency shall exercise any of the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a); except that until July 1, 1946, any of such powers may be exercised to the extent necessary to carry out a contract or agreement with such a foreign government made before July 1, 1943, or before the passage of such concurrent resolution, whichever is the earlier.

(d) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of convoying vessels by naval vessels of the United States.

(e) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of the entry of any American vessel into a combat area in violation of section 3 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

SECTION 4.

All contracts or agreements made for the disposition of any defense article or defense information pursuant to section 3 shall contain a clause by which the foreign government undertakes that it will not, without the consent of the President, transfer title to or possession of such defense article or defense information by gift, sale, or otherwise, or permit its use by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of such foreign government.

SECTION 5.

(a) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the Government involved shall, when any such defense article or defense information is exported, immediately inform the department or agency designated by the President to administer section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), of the quantities, character, value, terms of disposition, and destination of the article and information so exported.

(b) The President from time to time, but not less frequently than once every ninety days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this Act except such information as he deems incompatible with the public interest to disclose. Reports provided for under this subsection shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

SECTION 6

(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this Act.

(b) All money and all property which is converted into money received under section 3 from any government shall, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, revert to the respective appropriation or appropriations out of which funds were expended with respect to the defense article or defense information for which such consideration is received, and shall be available for expenditure for the purpose for which such expended funds were appropriated by law, during the fiscal year in which such funds are received and the ensuing fiscal year; but in no event shall any funds so received be available for expenditure after June 30, 1946.

SECTION 7.

The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the head of the department or agency shall in all contracts or agreements for the disposition of any defense article or defense information fully protect the rights of all citizens of the United States who have patent rights in and to any such article or information which is hereby authorized to be disposed of and the payments collected for royalties on such patents shall be paid to the owners and holders of such patents.

SECTION 8.

The Secretaries of War and of the Navy are hereby authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire arms, ammunition, and implements of war produced within the jurisdiction of any country to which section 3 is applicable, whenever the President deems such purchase or acquisition to be necessary in the interests of the defense of the United States.

38 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

SECTION 9

The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this Act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct

SECTION 10

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change existing law relating to the use of the land and naval forces of the United States, except insofar as such use relates to the manufacture, procurement, and repair of defense articles, the communication of information and other noncombatant purposes enumerated in this Act.

SECTION 11.

If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Public Law 11, 77th Cong.; originated as H.R. 1776;
D.A.F R., III, p. 712-15.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Address on "The United States and the World Situation" to the American Society of International Law, Washington, April 24, 1941¹

.

Although the task is huge, though time is pressing, and though the struggle may continue for a long time, I am confident that at the end there will come a better day. We are at work not only at the task of insuring our own safety but also at the task of creating ultimate conditions of peace with justice. We can help to lay a firm foundation for the independence, the security, and the returning prosperity of the members of the family of nations. I have absolute faith in the ultimate triumph of the principles of humanity, translated into law and order, by which freedom and justice and security will again prevail.

D. S. Bul., IV, p. 494.

¹ See also Mr. Hull's speech to the same society on May 13, 1940 (*D. S. Bul.*, II, p. 532).

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Radio Address on America's Post-War Program Inaugurating National Foreign Trade Week, May 18, 1941

.

. . . it is none too early to lay down at least some of the principles by which policies must be guided at the conclusion of the war, to press for a broad program of world economic reconstruction and to consider tentative plans for the application of those policies.

The main principles, as proven by experience, are few and simple:

1. Extreme nationalism must not again be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions.

2. Non-discrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so that international trade may grow and prosper.

3. Raw-material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination.

4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people.

5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries, and permit the payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries.

Measures taken to give effect to these principles must be freely open to every nation which desires a peaceful life in a world at peace and is willing to cooperate in maintaining that peace.

.

Unless a system of open trade becomes firmly established, there will be chronic political instability and recurrent economic collapse. There will never be peace in any real sense of the term.

In the final reckoning, the problem becomes one of establishing the foundations of an international order in which independent nations cooperate freely with each other for their mutual gain — of a world order, not new but renewed, which liberates rather than enslaves.

We shall not be able to do this until we have a world free from imminent military danger and clear of malign political intrigue. . . . We can expect no healthy development until the menace of conquest has been brought to an end. . . .

. . . We believe that there can be created a safer and more prosperous world. . . . But first the tide of force must be turned back. Once that is

done, we and other nations can reestablish an open, cooperative, economic life in which trade may increase, economic welfare may grow, civilization may advance, and the peaceful and benevolent instincts of masses of now prostrate people may once more flourish in the really worthwhile ways of life

D. S. Bul., IV, p. 575, *D. A. F. R.*, III, p. 452-3.

3. UNLIMITED NATIONAL EMERGENCY, MAY 27, 1941— DECEMBER 8, 1941

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Radio Address from the White House, May 27, 1941

Today the whole world is divided between human slavery and human freedom — between pagan brutality and the Christian ideal.

We choose human freedom — which is the Christian ideal.

No one of us can waver for a moment in his courage or his faith.

We will not accept a Hitler-dominated world. And we will not accept a world, like the postwar world of the nineteen-twenties, in which the seeds of Hitlerism can again be planted and allowed to grow.

We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech and expression — freedom of every person to worship God in his own way — freedom from want — and freedom from terrorism.

Is such a world impossible of attainment?

Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Emancipation Proclamation, and every other milestone in human progress — all were ideals which seemed impossible of attainment — yet they were attained.

As a military force, we were weak when we established our independence, but we successfully stood off tyrants, powerful in their day, tyrants who are now lost in the dust of history.

Odds meant nothing to us then. Shall we now, with all our potential strength, hesitate to take every single measure necessary to maintain our American liberties?

Our people and our Government will not hesitate to meet that challenge.

As the President of a united and determined people, I say solemnly:

We reassert the ancient American doctrine of freedom of the seas.

We reassert the solidarity of the twenty-one American Republics and the Dominion of Canada in the preservation of the independence of the hemisphere.

We have pledged material support to the other democracies of the world — and we will fulfill that pledge.

We in the Americas will decide for ourselves whether, and when, and where, our American interests are attacked or our security threatened.

We are placing our armed forces in strategic military position.

We will not hesitate to use our armed forces to repel attack.

We reassert our abiding faith in the vitality of our constitutional republic as a perpetual home of freedom, of tolerance, and of devotion to the word of God. . . .

D. S. Bul., IV, p. 653; *D.A.F.R.*, III, p. 57

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Letter to the Congress Transmitting the First Report on the Lend-Lease Act, June 10, 1941

. . . In the report that follows, facts and figures are given to the extent advisable without disclosing military secrets to benefit the Axis Powers. These facts describe the past and portray the present status of our aid to those nations so gallantly fighting the aggressors. They do not present the most important fact of all — the strong will of our people to see to it that these forces of aggression shall not rule the world.

We have before us a constant purpose not of present safety alone but, equally, of future survival.

Operations under Lend-Lease Act. Message from the President of the United States Transmitting, Pursuant to Law, First Report under the Act of March 11, 1941, June 11, 1941, p. v (S. Doc. No. 66, 77th Cong., 1st sess.); D.A.F.R., III, p. 734.

Formation of Joint Economic Committees, United States and Canada. Statement of the Department of State, June 17, 1941

The Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America announced on June 17 that they have established joint committees of inquiry to explore the possibility of a greater degree of economic cooperation between Canada and the United States. They will be known as the Joint Economic Committees.

The Committees have been instructed to study and to report to their respective governments on the possibilities of (1) effecting a more economic, more efficient, and more coordinated utilization of the combined resources of the two countries in the production of defense requirements (to the extent that this is not now being done)¹ and (2) reducing the

¹ Other joint committees include the Materials Coordination Committee established May 1941 and the Joint War Production Committee set up November 1941

probable post-war economic dislocation consequent upon the changes which the economy in each country is presently undergoing

It is the common belief of the two governments that such studies and reports should assist the governments and peoples of each country in formulating policies and actions for the better utilization of their productive capacities for the mutually greater benefit of each, both in the present emergency period and after the emergency has passed.

This joint inquiry marks one further step in the implementation of the declaration made by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Mackenzie King at Hyde Park on April 20, 1941.¹

D. S. Bul., IV, p 747; *D.A.F R.*, III, p 168.

Sumner Welles, Acting Secretary of State: "What Does the Future Hold?" Address at the Norwegian Legation, Washington, July 22, 1941

.
 . . . What does the future hold for us after this struggle is over? . . .

It seems to me that those of us who are fortunate enough to be able to live as citizens of the free American Republics have our great responsibility in the framing of the answer to that question.

For we all of us now see clearly, if we did not before, that no matter how great our American capacity for defense may be, no matter how perfect our hemispheric system may become, our future welfare must inevitably be contingent upon the existence in the rest of the world of equally peace-minded and equally secure peoples who not only will not, but cannot, become a source of potential danger to us in the New World.

I feel it is not premature for me to suggest that the free governments of peace-loving nations everywhere should even now be considering and discussing the way in which they can best prepare for the better day which must come, when the present contest is ended in the victory of the forces of liberty and of human freedom, and in the crushing defeat of those who are sacrificing mankind to their own lust for power and for loot.

At the end of the last war, a great President of the United States gave his life in the struggle to further the realization of the splendid vision which he had held up to the eyes of suffering humanity — the vision of an ordered world governed by law.

The League of Nations, as he conceived it, failed in part because of

¹ For text see *D. S. Bul.*, IV, p. 494; *D.A F.R.*, III, p. 161. For the character of the Declaration, see section Canada, p. 304.

the blind selfishness of men here in the United States, as well as in other parts of the world, it failed because of its utilization by certain powers primarily to advance their own political and commercial ambitions; but it failed chiefly because of the fact that it was forced to operate, by those who dominated its councils, as a means of maintaining the *status quo*. It was never enabled to operate as its chief spokesman had intended, as an elastic and impartial instrument in bringing about peaceful and equitable adjustments between nations as time and circumstance proved necessary

Some adequate instrumentality must unquestionably be found to achieve such adjustments when the nations of the earth again undertake the task of restoring law and order to a disastrously shaken world.

But whatever the mechanism which may be devised, of two things I am unalterably convinced.

First, that the abolition of offensive armaments and the limitation and reduction of defensive armaments and of the tools which make the construction of such armaments possible can only be undertaken through some rigid form of international supervision and control, and that without such practical and essential control, no real disarmament can ever be achieved; and

Second, that no peace which may be made in the future would be valid or lasting unless it established fully and adequately the natural rights of all peoples to equal economic enjoyment. So long as any one people or any one government possesses a monopoly over natural resources or raw materials which are needed by all peoples, there can be no basis for a world order based on justice and on peace.

I cannot believe that peoples of good will will not once more strive to realize the great ideal of an association of nations through which the freedom, the happiness and the security of all peoples may be achieved.

That word, security, represents the end upon which the hearts of men and women everywhere today are set.

Whether it be security from bombing from the air, or from mass destruction; whether it be security from want, disease, and starvation; whether it be security in enjoying that inalienable right which every human being should possess of living out his life in peace and happiness, people throughout the length and breadth of the world are demanding security, and freedom from fear.

That is the objective before us all today — to try and find the means of bringing that to pass.

“Not in vain the distance beacons.”

D. S. Bul., V, p. 75-6; *D A F.R.*, IV, p. 2-4.

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State: Address at the Reception¹ Given by the Grand Duchess of Luxemburg, Washington, August 8, 1941

It is the plan of this Government, when the tide of barbarity shall be rolled back, to turn the full measure of its economic strength to bringing help, relief, and sustenance to the tens of millions of families in many countries who are now hungry, cold, homeless, sick, separated, or in prison by the ruthless act of a group of tyrants.

Out of the shadows there emerge the outlines of the world to come.

In it, small nations will be able to live in freedom and in peace, in a family of nations ruled by law which respects the right of the weak as well as the strong. The basis of existence must be national. But a necessary condition must be a general accord under which all countries are assured of participation in the economic life of the world and under which all races are assured the right to live in conditions of equality and self-respect

Modern life has provided the tools, the capacity, and the transport which can assure freedom from want. It has created the communications which can guarantee freedom of information and of science. It can and must create the law which gives freedom from fear.

In the day of reconstruction the voices of those who suffer now will not be forgotten. We are bold to think that the sorrow of the present is the prelude to a coming age more secure, more brilliant, more gracious, and more free than any we have yet seen.

D. S. Bul., V, p. 111.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States and Winston S. Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain: Statement on the Atlantic Charter,² August 14, 1941

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high-ranking officers of their Military, Naval, and Air Services.

The whole problem of supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lease-Lend Act, for the armed forces of the United States and for those

¹ For George P. Waller, Consul of the United States.

² This statement was sent to the Congress by the President, August 21, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 358, 77th Cong., 1st sess.); see below, p. 45.

countries actively engaged in resisting aggression has been further examined

The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the stress which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

They have agreed on the following joint declaration:

[Here follows the Atlantic Charter, for text see section United Nations, p. 2.]

D. S. Bul, V, p. 125; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 10

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Comment on the Atlantic Charter, Press Conference, Washington, August 14, 1941

It is a statement of basic principles and fundamental ideas and policies that are universal in their practical application. They have heretofore been generally accepted by all civilized nations and were being strongly supported until certain countries decided to launch a universal movement to destroy the whole structure of civilized relations between nations and to establish a system of rule over peoples who would be conquered, based, as I said some days ago,¹ largely on barbarism and savagery. That interruption is still going on.

As I said, they are the basic doctrines and policies that have received the support of all civilized nations and should continue to receive their support until they are completely restored throughout the world.

D. S. Bul, V, p. 126; *D A.F.R.*, IV, p. 12.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: "Atlantic Charter." ² Message to Congress, August 21, 1941

... the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal which is worth while for our type of civilization to seek. It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with Nazism; or to agree to a world peace which would give to Nazism domination over large numbers of conquered nations. Inevitably such a peace would be a gift to

¹ Statement of August 4, *D. S. Bul*, V, p. 113; *D A F.R.*, IV, p. 4

² For text see United Nations, p. 2.

Nazism to take breath — armed breath — for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia to the American Hemisphere itself

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government.

It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the Declaration of Principles includes of necessity the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information. No society of the world organized under the announced principles could survive without these freedoms which are a part of the whole freedom for which we strive

D. S. Bul., V, p. 147, *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 12.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Labor Day Address, Hyde Park,¹ N. Y., September 1, 1941

There has never been a moment in our history when Americans were not ready to stand up as free men and fight for their rights

In times of national emergency one fact is brought home to us clearly and decisively — the fact that all of our rights are interdependent.

The right of freedom of worship would mean nothing without freedom of speech. And the rights of free labor as we know them today could not survive without the rights of free enterprise.

And we know that a free labor system is the very foundation of a functioning democracy. We know that one of the first acts of the Axis dictatorships has been to wipe out all the principles and standards which labor has been able to establish for its own preservation and advancement.

Trade unionism is a forbidden philosophy under these rule-or-ruin dictators. For trade unionism demands full freedom of expression and peaceful assembly. Trade unionism has helped to give to every one who toils the position of dignity which is his due.

American workers and American farmers, American businessmen, and American churchmen — all of us together — have the great responsibility and the great privilege of laboring to build a democratic world on enduring foundations.

D. S. Bul., V, p. 177-9; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 13.

¹ Broadcast from the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: World-Wide Broadcast Following the Attack on U. S. Destroyer Greer, September 11, 1941

.

. . . It is the Nazi design to abolish the freedom of the seas and to acquire absolute control and domination of these seas for themselves.

For with control of the seas in their own hands, the way can become clear for their next step — domination of the United States and the Western Hemisphere by force. Under Nazi control of the seas, no merchant ship of the United States or of any other American republic would be free to carry on any peaceful commerce, except by the condescending grace of this foreign and tyrannical power. The Atlantic Ocean which has been, and which should always be, a free and friendly highway for us would then become a deadly menace to the commerce of the United States, to the coasts of the United States, and even to the inland cities of the United States.

.

Generation after generation, America has battled for the general policy of the freedom of the seas. That policy is a very simple one — but a basic, fundamental one. It means that no nation has the right to make the broad oceans of the world, at great distances from the actual theater of land war, unsafe for the commerce of others.

That has been our policy, proved time and time again, in all our history.

Our policy has applied from time immemorial — and still applies — not merely to the Atlantic but to the Pacific and to all other oceans as well.

.

D. S. Bul., V, p. 193–7, Sen. Doc. No. 188, 77th Cong.,
2d sess., p. 114; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 18.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Letter to Congress Transmitting the Second Report on the Operations under Lend-Lease Act, September 11, 1941

.

The people of the United States know that we cannot live in a world dominated by Hitlerism. They realize that there can be no real peace, no secure freedom until we have destroyed the evil forces which seek to work us woe. Through their chosen representatives, they have declared a firm and unalterable policy to build up an impregnable defense for this hemisphere, and to furnish unstinted material aid to the countries fighting against Nazi aggression and tyranny.

We are not furnishing this aid as an act of charity or sympathy, but as a means of defending America. We offer it because we know that piecemeal resistance to aggression is doomed to failure; because the ruthless war machine which now bestrides the continent of Europe can be combatted only by the combined efforts of all free peoples and at all strategic points where the aggressor may strike.

The lend-lease program is no mere side issue to our program of arming for defense. It is an integral part, a keystone, in our great national effort to preserve our national security for generations to come, by crushing the disturbers of our peace.

To those peoples who are gallantly shedding their blood in the front lines of this struggle, we must offer not only a shield but a sword, not merely the means to permit the stalemate of protracted defense, but the tools of a final and total victory.

This country has evolved the greatest and most efficient industrial system in history. It is our task to turn the workshops of our industry into mighty forges of war — to outbuild the aggressors in every category of modern arms. Only in this way can we build the arsenal of democracy. . . . *Second Report under The Act of March 11, 1941 (Lend-Lease Act),* September 15, 1941, p. iv (Sen. Doc. No. 112, 77th Cong., 1st sess.).

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Address to the American Legion Convention, September 15, 1941

No war of significant proportions can now be fought anywhere in the world save by those nations which have access to the seas. Raw materials out of which the complicated instruments of war are wrought come from the four corners of the earth. No continent has a monopoly of them, and therefore those nations which possess sea power are the nations in the future into whose hands will be entrusted the peace of the world. . . . The only peace in which the world can put any confidence for at least one hundred years to come, is the kind of peace that can be enforced by the peace-loving nations of the world. It will not be sufficient just to win peace if these nations are to support the cause of peace effectively. It is imperatively necessary to have not only the will of peace but the power to enforce it.

In such a world as that of today sea power for America is more vital, more essential than ever before in its history. We are on the way to achieve that power. . . . You cannot preserve liberties such as we now enjoy save by willingness to fight for them if need be. . . . it is only the strong who can promote and preserve a righteous peace.

N.Y.T., September 16, 1941.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Press Interview Relating to Inter-Allied Meeting at London, September 24, 1941

.

The weakness of our situation (at the end of the war) will be that many of our economic institutions will no longer mesh with the institutions overseas. The millions of men and an industrial machine which were formerly used both in Europe and here to provide war materials will be thrown out of employment. We shall be faced immediately with the task of dealing with great distress overseas and we shall be fortunate if we do not have some at home, and I think that with clear vision, and using the highest guide of our instincts, we shall say that as a matter of course we must contribute to the reconstruction of an ordered world as rapidly as possible.

This means that we shall be sending goods which we produce in abundance to places where they are needed. We well know that paid or not, human suffering must be relieved. We shall find that the trade by which the world lives has to be re-established; and if there is no working capital to start it moving again, we shall find ourselves helping to set up a considerable part of the world in business again.

You may find international lawyers endeavoring to resolve conflicts so as to reopen contact between groups and individuals. You may find transport designed primarily to assure that goods are promptly taken to the places where they are most needed. You may even find banks and bankers pooling their resources so that the materials of life are everywhere available.

It seems fantastic today to suggest handing over some of our accumulated gold as a free gift to establish international currency, to let other nations set their house in order, and thereby re-establish trade and normal life. But this may not seem nearly so fantastic a few years hence. It seems impossible today to think of using the enormous resources of the Federal Reserve System as a means of rebuilding the shattered life of another continent, but when the time actually comes, and we are faced with that contingency, we may find that the idea looks more like an immediate necessity than a gang tale.

N.Y.T., September 25, 1941.

Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy: Address before the American Bar Association, Indianapolis, October 1, 1941

.

There can be provided no rule of law in the world unless the great highways of the nations, the lanes of the seven seas, are controlled by

powers which are peace-minded, justice-loving, and lacking in any desire for selfish aggrandizement. In the pursuit of these objectives there must be a disinterested purpose to keep the highways of the sea free from bandits. And in the pursuit of such an ideal we must not lose sight of, nor neglect, a proper and legitimate devotion to American security.

Our safety and our prosperity in the world of the future lies in a stern insistence upon the principle of the freedom of the seas, the assurance of equal opportunity for world trade; and the proviso that sea power shall not be made the instrument of selfish aggression.

It is by no means sufficient that we take those steps necessary to clear the sea lanes of the bandits which now infest them. . . . We must do our full share, and more, to guarantee that they shall be kept clear of pirates in the future. Our responsibility in this respect is very great. It must be proportionate to our enormous powers and resources, our geographical position, our ideals and our aspirations. If we are to be able to re-establish a world ruled by laws, and not by men, we must provide both the major power and the dominant leadership.

. . . what business is it of ours to police the seven seas? Why should we provide both the leadership and the major force to insure against another world war? . . . Twice we have learned from bitter experience that no matter how great our reluctance to participate, the world has now grown so small, so interrelated, so interdependent, that, try as we will, we cannot escape . . . the great law-abiding, peace-loving nations must take the power into their hands and keep it there for a long time to come to prevent the inauguration of another world war. . . . we must join our force, our power to that of Great Britain, another great peace-loving nation, to stop new aggression, which might lead to a world disturbance, at its beginnings.

We are not going to stop all wars. But I am convinced we, for our own safety and protection, and for the maintenance of our way of life, shall have to provide an interregnum in which we shall not only devote ourselves to the pursuit of peaceful aims, but provide the essential might to enforce such a peace on those who are not willing voluntarily to pursue such a course.

. . . we must produce and give effect to a system of international law by force if need be until world opinion the world over, like domestic opinion in our domestic affairs, recognizes the existence of that force and submits to a rule of law. . . .

Since the promotion of international law and justice is vital to our own security we must thoroughly understand that our national security has

its beginnings, and is founded on, control of the seas. . . Now and henceforth, the control of the high seas will rest in a Fleet which may exercise its functions under, on the surface, and above the seas.

. . . This freedom means that the great historic highways of the nations are free for the use of all alike, on even terms, save only those activities which are designed to be hostile and aggressive. Then it is that sea power becomes determinative and vital.

It is the hope of the world that sea power for the next hundred years at least will reside in the hands of the two great nations which now possess that power, the United States and Great Britain. You may say it is a dangerous power when controlled by so few, and there is truth in that reflection. But, feeble and inadequate as may be the impulses in American and British hearts for the common good, and the advancement of civilization, and likely as it may be that this power will sometimes be abused, it is far safer thus, than if that power should be permitted to pass into the hands of aggressive nations who seek their own selfish aggrandizement. . . we must strive . . . for the peace that is available. And this, for the immediate future, unquestionably means that dominant sea power will be more justly and equitably employed through the joint efforts of the United States and the British Empire, rather than in any other way now available to us. . . . Other nations of similar peaceful inclinations, and lacking in aggressive designs, could be joined to them, and thus the beginning would be made leading toward the restoration of international law; the policing of the highways, the opening of the door of opportunity to all peoples and the achievement of a world in which war, at last, shall be abandoned as an instrument of national policy. . . . respect for law must be restored if the world is to recover and popular government is to be preserved. And the only kind of peace which is available in this world, in which we live, is the kind of peace that can, and will be, enforced through the superior power of those nations that love justice and seek after peace.

Release from the Navy Department; *N.Y.T.*, October 2, 1941.

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State: Address at the World Trade Dinner of the Twenty-eighth National Foreign Trade Convention, New York, October 7, 1941¹

. . . the creation of conditions favorable to peaceful and profitable trade between nations is one of the cornerstones of the enduring peace which

¹ For Message by President Roosevelt, delivered on his behalf by Mr. Welles, see *D. S. Bul.*, V, p. 265.

we so earnestly hope may be constructed in the place of the social wreckage and economic ruin which will inevitably result from the present war.

.

The creation of an economic order in the post-war world which will give free play to individual enterprise, and at the same time render security to men and women, and provide for the progressive improvement of living standards, is almost as essential to the preservation of free institutions as is the actual winning of this war. And the preservation of our liberties — all-important in itself — is essential to the realization of the other great objective of mankind — an enduring peace. There can be no peace in a Hitler-ridden world.

In brief, in my judgment, the creation of that kind of sound economic order which I have described is essential to the attainment of those three great demands of men and women everywhere — freedom, security and peace.

.

In the immediate post-war period the task will primarily be one of reconstruction. Food and material of all kinds will be sorely needed. Both humanitarian considerations and self-interest require that we cooperate to these ends to the fullest extent of our ability. So long as any important part of the world is economically sick, we cannot be well.

Plans for meeting these requirements are already being considered. . . .

Both from the standpoint of immediate post-war needs and in the longer range aspect, we must give serious attention to the problems of nutrition. . . . But the basic problem in establishing a new and better world order is to obtain the application by the nations of the world of sound principles of commercial and economic policy.

The basic principles . . . have recently been enunciated in the eight-point joint declaration of the President and Mr. Churchill. . . .

This set of basic principles, appropriately called "The Atlantic Charter," deals with commercial policy in its fourth point. . . .

. . . I should, however, like to emphasize its meaning and significance.

The basic conception is that your Government is determined to move towards the creation of conditions under which restrictive and unconscionable tariffs, preferences, and discriminations are things of the past; under which no nation should seek to benefit itself at the expense of another; and under which destructive trade warfare shall be replaced by cooperation for the welfare of all nations.

The Atlantic Declaration means that every nation has a right to expect that its legitimate trade will not be diverted and throttled by

towering tariffs, preferences, discriminations, or narrow bilateral practices. . . . So long as we adhere and persistently implement the principles and policies which made possible the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act, the United States will not furnish, as it did after the last war, an excuse for trade-destroying and trade-diverting practices.

. . . in the long run no nation can prosper by itself or at the expense of others and . . . no nation can live unto itself alone.

.
D. S. Bul , V, p 266-71, *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 690.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message to the Congress on Neutrality Law Revision, October 9, 1941

.
We intend to maintain the policy of protecting the freedom of the seas against domination by any foreign power which has become crazed with a desire to control the world . . .

D. S. Bul., V, p 257-9, *Arming of American-Flag Ships Engaged in Foreign Commerce. Message of the President of the United States transmitting a Recommendation for the Repeal of Section 6 of the Act of November 4, 1939* . . ., House Doc No. 404, 77th Congress, 1st sess.; *D.A.F.R.* , IV, p. 23.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Statement on Execution of Hostages by the Nazis, October 25, 1941

The practice of executing scores of innocent hostages in reprisal for isolated attacks on Germans in countries temporarily under the Nazi heel revolts a world already inured to suffering and brutality. Civilized peoples long ago adopted the basic principle that no man should be punished for the deed of another. Unable to apprehend the persons involved in these attacks the Nazis characteristically slaughter fifty or a hundred innocent persons. Those who would "collaborate" with Hitler or try to appease him cannot ignore this ghastly warning.

The Nazis might have learned from the last war the impossibility of breaking men's spirit by terrorism. Instead they develop their *lebensraum* and "new order" by depths of frightfulness which even they have never approached before. These are the acts of desperate men who know in their hearts that they cannot win. Frightfulness can never bring peace to Europe. It only sows the seeds of hatred which will one day bring fearful retribution.

D. S. Bul., V, p. 317; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 662.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Address on Navy and Total Defense Day Concerning the Attack upon the U. S. Destroyer Kearny, October 27, 1941

The forward march of Hitlerism can be stopped — and it will be stopped.

Very simply and very bluntly — we are pledged to pull our own oar in the destruction of Hitlerism

And when we have helped to end the curse of Hitlerism we shall help to establish a new peace which will give to decent people everywhere a better chance to live and prosper in security and in freedom and in faith.

Each day that passes we are producing and providing more and more arms for the men who are fighting on actual battlefronts. That is our primary task.

And it is the Nation's will that these vital arms and supplies of all kinds shall neither be locked up in American harbors nor sent to the bottom of the sea. It is the Nation's will that America shall deliver the goods. In open defiance of that will, our ships have been sunk and our sailors have been killed

I say that we do not propose to take this lying down

Our determination not to take it lying down has been expressed in the orders to the American Navy to shoot on sight. Those orders stand.

Furthermore, the House of Representatives has already voted to amend part of the Neutrality Act of 1939, today outmoded by force of violent circumstances. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has also recommended elimination of other hamstringing provisions in that act. That is the course of honesty and of realism.

Our American merchant ships must be armed to defend themselves against the rattlesnakes of the sea.

Our American merchant ships must be free to carry our American goods into the harbors of our friends.

Our American merchant ships must be protected by our American Navy.

It can never be doubted that the goods will be delivered by this Nation, whose Navy believes in the tradition of "Damn the torpedoes; full speed ahead!"

Our national will must speak from every assembly line in our vast industrial machine. Our factories and our shipyards are constantly expanding. Our output must be multiplied.

It cannot be hampered by the selfish obstruction of a small but dangerous minority of industrial managers who hold out for extra profits or

for "business as usual." It cannot be hampered by the selfish obstruction of a small but dangerous minority of labor leaders who are a menace to the true cause of labor itself, as well as to the Nation as a whole.

The lines of our essential defense now cover all the seas, and to meet the extraordinary demands of today and tomorrow our Navy grows to unprecedented size. Our Navy is ready for action. Indeed, units of it in the Atlantic patrol are in action. Its officers and men need no praise from me.

Our new Army is steadily developing the strength needed to withstand the aggressors. Our soldiers of today are worthy of the proudest traditions of the United States Army. But traditions cannot shoot down dive bombers or destroy tanks. That is why we must and shall provide, for every one of our soldiers, equipment and weapons — not merely as good but better than that of any other army on earth. And we are doing that right now.

For this — and all of this — is what we mean by total national defense.

The first objective of that defense is to stop Hitler. He can be stopped and can be compelled to dig in. And that will be the beginning of his downfall, because dictatorship of the Hitler type can live only through continuing victories — increasing conquests . . .

D. S. Bul, V, p. 342-3; *Sen. Doc. No. 188*, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 120; *D. A. F. R.*, IV, p. 29

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Address before the Delegates of the International Labor Conference, the White House, Washington, November 6, 1941

The essence of our struggle is that men shall be free. There can be no real freedom for the common man without enlightened social policies. In the last analysis, they are the stakes for which democracies are today fighting

Your concern is the concern of all democratic peoples. To many of your member States, adherence to the International Labor Organization has meant great sacrifice. There is no greater evidence of the vitality of the I.L.O. than the loyal presence here today of the representatives of the nations which suffer under the lash of the dictator. I welcome those representatives especially.

In the process of working and fighting for victory, however, we must never permit ourselves to forget the goal that is beyond victory. The

defeat of Hitlerism is necessary so that there may be freedom; but this war, like the last war, will produce nothing but destruction unless we prepare for the future now. We plan now for the better world we aim to build.

If that world is to be one in which peace is to prevail, there must be a more abundant life for the masses of the people of all countries. In the words of the Atlantic Charter, we "desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security."

.

We are already engaged in surveying the immediate post-war requirements of a world whose economies have been disrupted by war.

We are planning not to provide temporary remedies for the ills of a stricken world; we are planning to achieve permanent cures — to help establish a sounder world life.

To attain these goals will be no easy task. Yes, their fulfillment will require "the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field." We have learned too well that social problems and economic problems are not separate watertight compartments in the international field any more than in the national sphere. In international, as in national, affairs, economic policy can no longer be an end in itself. It is merely a means for achieving social objectives.

There must be no place in the post-war world for special privilege for either individuals or nations. Again in the words of the Atlantic Charter: "All States, great and small, victor or vanquished," must have "access, in equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

In the planning of such international action the I.L.O., with its representation of labor and management, its technical knowledge and experience, will be an invaluable instrument for peace. Your organization will have an essential part to play in building up a stable international system of social justice for all peoples everywhere. As part of you, the people of the United States are determined to respond fully to the opportunity and challenge of this historic responsibility, so well exemplified at this historic meeting in this historic home of an ancient democracy.

D. S. Bul., V, p. 357-60; Conference of the International Labour Organisation, 1941, New York and Washington, D.C., *Record of Proceedings*, Montreal, 1941, p. 156; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 33-6.

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State: Speech on "The Unforgotten Nations" at the Belgian Embassy, Washington, November 7, 1941

Tonight we may take Belgium as an example of the unforgotten: The small nations of Europe who have faced military conquest, but are undefeated; who have met every attempt to divide them politically, but who remain unified; who have borne slavery, but who have refused to become slaves; whose combined spirit makes it certain that force and frightfulness will never serve to govern Europe and will never be triumphant in the world.

Slowly the fact is becoming plain that the only life in the world worth living is a life conceived within a family of free and law-abiding nations. In this family we know of no slave nations. All are entitled to their place. As the tide of conquest is rolled back, as surely it will be, the unforgotten peoples will resume their rightful place in a world which once more holds its loyalty to justice and not force.

D. S. Bul, V, p. 368.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Outline of Proposed Basis for Agreement between the United States and Japan Presented to the Japanese Ambassador in the Course of Discussions between Representatives of the Two Governments, Washington, November 26, 1941

Section I

DRAFT MUTUAL DECLARATION OF POLICY

The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan both being solicitous for the peace of the Pacific affirm that their national policies are directed toward lasting and extensive peace throughout the Pacific area, that they have no territorial designs in that area, that they have no intention of threatening other countries or of using military force aggressively against any neighboring nation, and that, accordingly, in their national policies they will actively support and give practical application to the following fundamental principles upon which their relations with each other and with all other governments are based:

- (1) The principle of inviolability of territorial integrity and sovereignty of each and all nations.
- (2) The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

(3) The principle of equality, including equality of commercial opportunity and treatment.

(4) The principle of reliance upon international cooperation and conciliation for the prevention and pacific settlement of controversies and for improvement of international conditions by peaceful methods and processes.

The Government of Japan and the Government of the United States have agreed that toward eliminating chronic political instability, preventing recurrent economic collapse, and providing a basis for peace, they will actively support and practically apply the following principles in their economic relations with each other and with other nations and peoples:

(1) The principle of non-discrimination in international commercial relations.

(2) The principle of international economic cooperation and abolition of extreme nationalism as expressed in excessive trade restrictions.

(3) The principle of non-discriminatory access by all nations to raw material supplies.

(4) The principle of full protection of the interests of consuming countries and populations as regards the operation of international commodity agreements.

(5) The principle of establishment of such institutions and arrangements of international finance as may lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries and may permit payments through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries.

Section II

STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND BY THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN

The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan propose to take steps as follows:

1. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will endeavor to conclude a multilateral non-aggression pact among the British Empire, China, Japan, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Thailand and the United States.

2. Both Governments will endeavor to conclude among the American, British, Chinese, Japanese, the Netherland and Thai Governments an agreement whereunder each of the Governments would pledge itself to respect the territorial integrity of French Indo-China and, in the event that there should develop a threat to the territorial integrity of

Indo-China, to enter into immediate consultation with a view to taking such measures as may be deemed necessary and advisable to meet the threat in question. Such agreement would provide also that each of the Governments party to the agreement would not seek or accept preferential treatment in its trade or economic relations with Indo-China and would use its influence to obtain for each of the signatories equality of treatment in trade and commerce with French Indo-China.

3. The Government of Japan will withdraw all military, naval, air and police forces from China and from Indo-China.

4. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will not support — militarily, politically, economically — any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chungking.

5. Both Governments will give up extraterritorial rights in China, including rights and interests in and with regard to international settlements and concessions, and rights under the Boxer Protocol of 1901.

Both Governments will endeavor to obtain the agreement of the British and other governments to give up extraterritorial rights in China, including rights in international settlements and in concessions and under the Boxer Protocol of 1901.

6 The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will enter into negotiations for the conclusion between the United States and Japan of a trade agreement, based upon reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment and reduction of trade barriers by both countries, including an undertaking by the United States to bind raw silk on the free list.

7. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will, respectively, remove the freezing restrictions on Japanese funds in the United States and on American funds in Japan.

8. Both Governments will agree upon a plan for the stabilization of the dollar-yen rate, with the allocation of funds adequate for this purpose, half to be supplied by Japan and half by the United States.

9. Both Governments will agree that no agreement which either has concluded with any third power or powers shall be interpreted by it in such a way as to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement; the establishment and preservation of peace throughout the Pacific area.

10. Both Governments will use their influence to cause other governments to adhere to and to give practical application to the basic political and economic principles set forth in this agreement.

John G. Winant, Ambassador to Great Britain: Address at a Luncheon Given by the Lord Mayor and the Corporation of Liverpool and the Mayors of Merseyside, Liverpool, November 26, 1941

When the war is over we both will have to face an internal and an external reconstruction in our two countries which must involve broad changes of policy. Among the questions that will have to be dealt with are those of exchange, of trade, and with them of employment and the standard of living. These are things which should be studied and understood now so that the mistakes following the last war can be avoided when this war is ended.

. . . We have come to learn within our individual countries that an order which is based on the assumption that we could create prosperity and security by setting each man to pursue his own individual self-interest without relation to the common good could not be maintained. . . . We are coming to recognize more clearly than ever before that we must clothe freedom with a positive significance. . . . This calls for a political philosophy which not only includes individual and corporate relationships within the state but reaches beyond selfish nationalism to a plan of political and economic collaboration in order that we may join together to create a prosperous and peaceful world.

. . . Divergencies between Great Britain and the United States might easily arise if each country insisted on becoming as self-sufficient as possible in respect to producing goods of outstanding importance in war-time. This policy would necessitate the production at high cost within one country of goods which could be produced at much lower cost in the other country and this would involve the erection of serious obstacles to trade. The argument would be that though such barriers to trade and such high-cost production were regrettable they were rendered necessary by the possibility of another war. Such a development would seriously imperil satisfactory economic relations between Great Britain and the United States. This is only one situation which makes it clear that political security is an essential prerequisite to freer trade and the United States and Great Britain will have to cooperate in the maintenance of international security if they are to cooperate in the maintenance of satisfactory economic relations. The two subjects are essentially bound up together.

The converse is equally true. If the two countries attempted to collaborate on a security basis and then found themselves engaged in a sharp competitive struggle for foreign trade, the degree of cooperation to ensure world peace might be seriously compromised. We must con-

tinue to learn to work together. Collaboration without discrimination is a cornerstone of reconstruction.

The great achievements in war production in the last year and a half show what can be done when a democracy is united by a single objective. In the process it has been necessary to cut down consumer goods in order to divert labor equipment and materials for the production of goods most useful in waging war. The restriction of some consumer goods is one of the prices we must pay for destroying the menace of Hitlerite Germany but after the war has been won this policy will have to be reversed. If we are to make democracy a reality in the fullest sense we must make an effort, not less determined than the effort which we made to win the war, to employ our labor materials and equipment to the fullest extent in order to achieve not merely an adequate but an abundant standard of living for the entire population.

There will be difficulties to be sure. Planning and cooperation and an enormous amount of hard work will be necessary but the key to success is to be found in this principle: we must set up as our primary objective and as a first charge upon our resources the production of goods necessary to provide an adequate supply of basic consumer goods to everyone in the community. The world desperately wants the "four freedoms," but the most needed and the one to which we should turn our attention most immediately and energetically after the war is "freedom from want." For example, the needs for better and more varied food, for improved housing, clothing, and medical care are almost unlimited if the democracies were to agree to give a peace-time priority to the attainment of these aims and to pursue them with the same energy they are showing in the pursuit of war aims. Then we should go far towards banishing want from democratic societies.

Copy received by the Department of State, Washington,
The Times, November 27, 1941, p. 2.

4. STATE OF WAR, DECEMBER 8, 1941—DECEMBER 31, 1942

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Radio Address to the Nation, following a Declaration of a State of War with Japan, White House, December 9, 1941

Together with other free peoples, we are now fighting to maintain our right to live among our world neighbors in freedom and in common decency, without fear of assault.

... the United States can accept no result save victory, final and complete. Not only must the shame of Japanese treachery be wiped out, but the sources of international brutality, wherever they exist, must be absolutely and finally broken.

In my message to Congress ¹ yesterday I said that we "will make very certain that this form of treachery shall never endanger us again." In order to achieve that certainty, we must begin the great task that is before us by abandoning once and for all the illusion that we can ever again isolate ourselves from the rest of humanity.

In these past few years — and, most violently, in the past few days — we have learned a terrible lesson.

It is our obligation to our dead — it is our sacred obligation to their children and our children — that we must never forget what we have learned.

And what we all have learned is this:

There is no such thing as security for any nation — or any individual — in a world ruled by the principles of gangsterism.

There is no such thing as impregnable defense against powerful aggressors who sneak up in the dark and strike without warning.

We have learned that our ocean-girt hemisphere is not immune from severe attack — that we cannot measure our safety in terms of miles on any map.

We may acknowledge that our enemies have performed a brilliant feat of deception, perfectly timed and executed with great skill. It was a thoroughly dishonorable deed, but we must face the fact that modern warfare as conducted in the Nazi manner is a dirty business. We don't like it — we didn't want to get in it — but we are in it, and we're going to fight it with everything we've got.

I do not think any American has any doubt of our ability to administer proper punishment to the perpetrators of these crimes.

.

The true goal we seek is far above and beyond the ugly field of battle. When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. We Americans are not destroyers — we are builders.

We are now in the midst of a war, not for conquest, not for vengeance, but for a world in which this Nation, and all that this Nation represents, will be safe for our children. We expect to eliminate the danger from

¹ See *D. S. Bul.*, V, p. 474; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 113.

Japan, but it would serve us ill if we accomplished that and found that the rest of the world was dominated by Hitler and Mussolini.

We are going to win the war and we are going to win the peace that follows.

And in the dark hours of this day — and through dark days that may be yet to come — we will know that the vast majority of the members of the human race are on our side. Many of them are fighting with us. All of them are praying for us. For, in representing our cause, we represent theirs as well — our hope and their hope for liberty under God.

D. S. Bul., V, p. 476–80; *Sen. Doc. No. 188*, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 127; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 37.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message to Congress, Summary of American Past Policy in the Pacific, December 15, 1941

... the United States steadfastly advocated certain basic principles which should govern international relations. These were:

The principle of inviolability of territorial integrity and sovereignty of all nations.

The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

The principle of equality — including equality of commercial opportunity and treatment.

The principle of reliance upon international cooperation and conciliation for the prevention, and pacific settlement, of controversies.

These [countries which have declared war against Japan] and other peace-loving countries will be fighting as are we, first, to put an end to Japan's program of aggression and, second, to make good the right of nations and of mankind to live in peace under conditions of security and justice.

D. S. Bul., V, p. 533–6; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 476, 481.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Radio Address on One Hundred Fiftieth Anniversary of Adoption of Bill of Rights, Washington, December 15, 1941

No date in the long history of freedom means more to liberty-loving men in all liberty-loving countries than the fifteenth day of December, 1791. On that day, one hundred and fifty years ago, a new nation, through an elected Congress, adopted a declaration of human rights

which has influenced the thinking of all mankind from one end of the world to the other.

There is not a single republic of this hemisphere which has not adopted in its fundamental law the basic principles of freedom of man and freedom of mind enacted in the American Bill of Rights.

There is not a country, large or small, on this continent which has not felt the influence of that document, directly or indirectly.

Indeed, prior to the year 1933, the essential validity of the American Bill of Rights was accepted at least in principle. Even today, with the exception of Germany, Italy and Japan, the peoples of the world — in all probability four-fifths of them — support its principles, its teachings and its glorious results.

But, in the year 1933, there came to power in Germany a political clique which did not accept the declarations of the American bill of human rights as valid: a small clique of ambitious and unscrupulous politicians whose announced and admitted platform was precisely the destruction of the rights that instrument declared. Indeed the entire program and goal of these political and moral tigers was nothing more than the overthrow, throughout the earth, of the great revolution of human liberty of which our American Bill of Rights is the mother charter.

.

What we face is nothing more nor less than an attempt to overthrow and to cancel out the great upsurge of human liberty of which the American Bill of Rights is the fundamental document: to force the peoples of the earth, and among them the peoples of this continent, to accept again the absolute authority and despotic rule from which the courage and the resolution and the sacrifices of their ancestors liberated them many, many years ago.

It is an attempt which could succeed only if those who have inherited the gift of liberty had lost the manhood to preserve it. But we Americans know that the determination of this generation of our people to preserve liberty is as fixed and certain as the determination of that earlier generation of Americans to win it.

We will not, under any threat, or in the face of any danger, surrender the guarantees of liberty our forefathers framed for us in our Bill of Rights.

We hold with all the passion of our hearts and minds to those commitments of the human spirit.

We are solemnly determined that no power or combination of powers of this earth shall shake our hold upon them.

We covenant with each other before all the world, that having taken up arms in the defense of liberty, we will not lay them down before liberty is once again secure in the world we live in. For that security we pray; for that security we act — now and evermore.

D. S. Bul., V, p. 564; *Sen. Doc. No. 188*, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 134; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 43.

Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy: Speech at Graduation Exercises, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, December 19, 1941

. . . our greatest assets are not in material things. They are to be found in what we are fighting for — and what we are fighting against.

Our enemies seek to make the whole world subject to a small group of tyrannous powers. We fight to preserve the freedom of all peoples. Our enemies proclaim the virtues of so-called superior races with a mystical right to oppress all the other peoples of the earth. We fight for a world where every race and every nation will have an equal chance to grow and prosper. They proclaim war as the ultimate function of man. We see war as a horrible necessity, to be resorted to only when all else has failed.

To such a battle there can only be one outcome. For the will to be free, the will to be at peace, the will to be happy — these are the fundamental driving forces of the human race. They have brought man up from the primeval ooze, and they are not to be blocked now by any man or any nation. . . .

Release from Navy Department, Washington, 1941.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message to the People of the Philippine Islands, December 28, 1941

.

The people of the United States will never forget what the people of the Philippine Islands are doing this day and will do in the days to come. I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected. The entire resources, in men and in material, of the United States stand behind that pledge.

.

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 5.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Statement Following Signature of the United Nations' Declaration Affirming the Atlantic Charter, January 1, 1942

The Declaration by the United Nations joins together, in the greatest common war effort in history, the purpose and will of 26 free nations, representing the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of all 6 continents.¹ This is a living proof that law-abiding and peace-loving nations can unite in using the sword when necessary to preserve liberty and justice and the fundamental values of mankind. Against this host we can be sure that the forces of barbaric savagery and organized wickedness cannot and will not prevail.

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 4.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Annual Message to Congress, January 6, 1942

Our own objectives are clear; the objective of smashing the militarism imposed by war lords upon their enslaved peoples — the objective of liberating the subjugated nations — the objective of establishing and securing freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear everywhere in the world.

We shall not stop short of these objectives — nor shall we be satisfied merely to gain them and then call it a day. I know that I speak for the American people — and I have good reason to believe I speak also for all the other peoples that fight with us — when I say that this time we are determined not only to win the war but also to maintain the security of the peace which will follow.

But we of the United Nations are not making all this sacrifice of human effort and human lives to return to the kind of world we had after the last world war.

We are fighting today for security, for progress, and for peace, not only for ourselves but for all men, not only for one generation but for all generations. We are fighting to cleanse the world of ancient evils, ancient ills.

Our enemies are guided by brutal cynicism, by unholy contempt for the human race. We are inspired by a faith which goes back through all the years to the first chapter of the Book of Genesis: "God created man in His own image."

¹ See section United Nations, p. 1.

We on our side are striving to be true to that divine heritage. We are fighting, as our fathers have fought, to uphold the doctrine that all men are equal in the sight of God. Those on the other side are striving to destroy this deep belief and to create a world in their own image—a world of tyranny and cruelty and serfdom.

That is the conflict that day and night now pervades our lives. No compromise can end that conflict. There never has been — there never can be — successful compromise between good and evil. Only total victory can reward the champions of tolerance and decency and freedom and faith.

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 39-43; Sen. Doc. No. 188, 77th Cong.
2d sess., p. 136; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 45.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message to the People of Belgium, January 1942

During the month of January 1942, the President addressed a similar message to the people of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Occupied France, Greece, Yugoslavia, the Netherlands, Norway and Poland. This message was broadcast to each of these countries in its own language by the Office of the Coordinator of Information.

. . . The United States pledges its entire resources to destroy the conqueror and to restore self-government to Belgium. Only by a complete destruction of Hitlerism can the occupation be ended.

President Roosevelt has authorized the United States radio to say in his name that the sacrifices of all people who love liberty shall not be in vain. Belgium will emerge from her present struggle a better and a stronger country.

And after the war, the United Nations, including Belgium, are assured of winning the peace. President Roosevelt said: "We are determined not only to win the war, but also to maintain the security of the peace which will follow." . . .

. . . The might of the United Nations is now so great, its aims so clear, that only the time of defeat for Hitlerism remains doubtful. President Roosevelt said: "We shall not fight isolated wars, each nation going its own way. Twenty-six nations are united, not in spirit and determination alone, but in the broad conduct of war in all its phases. . . . Gone forever are the days when the aggressors could attack and destroy their victims one by one without unity of resistance."

The objectives in this war are clear, the President said: "The objective of smashing the militarism imposed by war lords upon their enslaved peoples — the objective of liberating the subjugated nations — the objective of establishing and securing freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear everywhere in the world."

These aims are not new to Belgians — nor to Americans. The United States and Belgium have worked for them shoulder to shoulder in the community of nations. Belgium's contributions toward the betterment of humanity have been great in the past. In culture, in art, and in science and industry, Belgium has ranked in the forefront of progressive nations. That country is guiltless of aggression. She has suffered terribly by the aggressive ambitions of Germany — twice, within the memory of most of her people. These wrongs shall be righted. Germany shall not again be allowed to impose her tyranny on peace-loving Belgium. Belgium's cause is humanity's cause.

.
I-A. R., 1942, II, p. 2; *News from Belgium*, 1942, II, 4, p. 25-7;
D.A.F.R., IV, p. 664.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Statement Announcing the Conclusion of the Mutual Aid Agreement with the United Kingdom,¹ February 24, 1942

. . . It shall be a settlement by agreement open to participation by all other nations of like mind. Its purpose shall be not to burden but to improve world-wide economic relations. Its aims will be to provide appropriate national and international measures to expand production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which, the agreement states, are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples, to eliminate all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and generally, to attain the economic objectives of the Atlantic Charter.

To that end Article VII provides for the early commencement of conversations, within the framework which it outlines, with a view to establishing now the foundations upon which we may create after the war a system of enlarged production, exchange, and consumption of goods for the satisfaction of human needs in our country, in the British Commonwealth, and in all other countries which are willing to join in this great effort.

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 190.

¹ For text, see United Nations, p. 10.

*Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State: Radio Address on
"United Nations and United Peoples," March 1, 1942*

.

The war of the United Nations is a people's war.

.

A people's war is vastly different from a war of politicians or governments. Rather, it is a kind of revolution — in this case, a kindly revolution — fighting to crush a cruel revolution. It is a war of men to preserve their right to be men, fought against slave armies led by masters who propose to wipe out even the right to manhood. The Declaration by the United Nations, like the Declaration of Independence, speaks not of desire to seize territory or plunder or power. It speaks of the rights of men by which you and I live: The right to be free to worship God; the right to be free from fear of foreign bombs or bayonets; the right to think; the right to be fed and clothed and housed in a modern world which can give food and shelter and clothing for every child, woman, and man in this teeming earth. As these rights are made valid by victorious arms, they mean, and were intended to mean, the beginning of a new world era.

They mean freedom for the great masses in Asia. They mean release for the slaves of Nazi-occupied Europe. They mean that the materials and resources of the world will be administered so as to be accessible to all nations. They mean that a measure of security will be provided for individual men and women. They mean that the highways of land and sea are open to everyone who will trade or travel in peace.

For these, the peoples are on the march by hundreds of millions upon hundreds of millions; and you and I are among them.

As these united peoples join ranks there is no distinction or discrimination of race or color or class or creed. There is no master race. The common bond is that of common, decent, kindly humanity. In worthiness, the bond could be no less.

Within this great frame the methods of making the ultimate peace are already appearing. The American family of nations comprises an entire hemisphere and has learned to live together in peace and in friendship and in mutual help. The British Commonwealth of Nations, another great family working likewise toward a common helpfulness, is a second great group. In Europe, nation after nation is joining hands with its neighbors and friends, as Russia and Poland did only the other

day. In Asia, the leader of a Free China talks to India, and Filipinos fight shoulder to shoulder with MacArthur. These nations fight together in war, which is great, but they will work together when they have conquered cruelty and won the peace, which is greater still.

Even as they forge the great organizations of war they plan the use of these organizations to relieve the distress of the world when war is done and to bring again peace, order, and fruitfulness to a devastated world, under law which will protect freedom and render an economic system which gives opportunity and life.

The measures for doing this are already in existence.

We are free from the bonds of outworn finance. You have noticed that no war effort is limited on financial grounds. Food, arms, and materials go from those who have them to those who need them. We call this in America "lend lease," and under that system the needs of peoples will be met from China to the English Channel. As more peoples are freed to join the United Nations, they receive their share.

By means of the joint supply and transport authorities, a vast transport system is coming into existence which will be able in time to serve all parts of the earth by sea and air.

Already the system of communication and the press has given a common language and a common thought which has brought nations closer together. Uruguay knows the opinion of Ottawa; Chicago knows the thinking of Chungking.

The forces of the United Nations by sea and land and air are great instruments of law. They are engaged in crushing international criminals who have sought to rob and murder and oppress. They act by common counsel and they work under united commands. They are friends among themselves, and friends and givers of freedom in the nations to which they come.

In such a war and with such a group there can be no end but victory. No other result is worth having. Freedom is indivisible.

The United Nations have soberly estimated the great burden which history has given them and which they have proudly assumed. But they have strength, the resources, and the ability to win. . . .

.

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 204-5.

*Leo Pasvolsky, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State: Speech on "The Problems of Economic Peace After the War," Delaware, Ohio, March 4, 1942*¹

.

The winning of the war is but the first stage in the winning of the peace. Wars are not fought for their own sake, but for the sake of determining which of the protagonists will shape the peace that follows.

.

After this second world war, the central problem confronting mankind will be exactly the same as that which confronted us after the last war. That problem is dual in character.

First, to create a system of international political relationships which would offer a reasonable hope for the preservation of a just peace among nations with the least practicable diversion of economic effort to the maintenance of armed forces; and

Second, to create, domestically and internationally, economic conditions which would make possible a progressive movement toward an efficient utilization of the human and material resources of the world on a scale adequate to insure the greatest practicable measure of full and stable employment accompanied by rising standards of living everywhere.

These basic objectives were stated clearly in the Atlantic Declaration of last August. They were re-endorsed in the Joint Declaration of the United Nations of two months ago.

The two objectives are closely interrelated. Sound economic policies will be impossible without confidence that peace will prevail and without assurance that the burden of armaments will be reduced to manageable proportions. But peace will be precarious at best, unless there exists for it a sound economic foundation. Both objectives, therefore, must be pursued simultaneously.

The full attainment of both of these objectives will necessarily be a long process, proceeding in a series of stages. What is important is that progress in each field be such as to reinforce progress in the other. And progress will have to be measured in terms of the speed and effectiveness with which appropriate machinery is set up in each field.

I shall not deal in this address with the machinery which will be necessary for the attainment of the political peace objective. On the as-

¹ Delivered at the National Study Conference of the Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

sumption that such machinery will be created, I shall focus my attention on the types of action which will be involved in the creation of the necessary economic machinery, especially in the international field.

Thus international economic relations are not an end in themselves. They are rather an integral part of the whole complex of economic activity whereby the material wants of man are satisfied, and in the efficacy of which international economic relations are a determining economic factor.

In a world organized along national lines, much of that activity is necessarily domestic, and economic progress is obviously impossible without appropriate domestic policies and measures, but it is equally impossible in conditions of economic war. Its mainsprings lie solely neither in the field of domestic action nor in the field of international action but in a proper combination of the two.

The basic requirements of economic progress are expansion and improvement of production and increase of international trade, which are primary prerequisites of increased consumption. Increased production and increased trade are themselves inescapably interdependent factors. In the long run, neither is possible without the other, but neither flows automatically from the other.

The expansion and improvement of each country's productive facilities and the creation of other conditions conducive to increased consumption require many domestic policies and measures. To the extent to which such policies and measures are successful, they of course stimulate international commerce. But domestic action cannot be fully successful unless it takes place in conditions in which the trade process itself is not prevented, by inappropriate international policies, from making its indispensable contribution to growing production and growing consumption. The creation of these conditions is a task of international collaboration in a number of fields of international economic relationships.

The creation after the war — as rapidly as possible and as fully as possible — of conditions indispensable to a system of world trade operating on the basis of a substantial freedom from obstructive regulation and on the basis of multilateral balancing of international accounts will be an urgent requirement for all countries, including our own. Unless that need is met, production and trade will stagnate everywhere, no matter what other measures are taken, and living standards will suffer in consequence.

In this fundamental respect the situation after the present war will be no different in character but far more difficult than was that which existed after the last war. And there will be one new factor of the utmost importance. After this war more will be expected of the reconstruction process than was the case after the last one. A greater emphasis than ever before is being placed on the so-called "social objective." Governments everywhere will have to make good their present promises to create conditions of economic security and higher levels of individual well-being.

These are, unquestionably, attainable objectives, in terms of the availability of basic resources and the possibilities of a proper utilization of these resources. But their actual attainment will depend on the type of basic policies which are adopted and resolutely pursued.

It was in the field of these policies that lay the principal mistakes and failures of the last post-war reconstruction effort. The dangers inherent in a repetition of these failures will be far greater than they were then. After this war mankind will be even less able to afford the mistakes made after the last war.

[There follows an analysis of the mistakes made during the last post-war reconstruction effort and the whole interval between the two wars]

After this conflict, as after the last, the transition from war to peace will involve two principal stages: demobilization and reconstruction. The two stages will, of course, overlap.

Some of the problems of the immediate post-war or demobilization period are obvious. Many areas of the world will be in desperate need of food, clothing, medical supplies, and other necessities of which their larders will have been swept bare by the war and the looting tactics of the invaders. These urgent needs will have to be met quickly, both for humanitarian reasons and for the purpose of minimizing the chances of social upheavals.

The task of putting into effect the necessary arrangements will, in any event, be greatly complicated by the difficulties which will, unquestionably, be involved in setting up effective administrations in many of what are now belligerent or invaded countries. The speed with which relief is provided may be a decisive factor in easing or even obviating some of these difficulties.

The measures of relief will, of course, be only a part of the immediate post-war problem. No nation will want to remain long an object of charity, nor will any nation, even the United States, be able to provide such charity indefinitely. The real demobilization process — return to

74 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

peaceful employment of millions of men comprising the fighting forces or working in war production, and reorientation of agricultural and especially industrial plants and equipment from military to peaceful pursuits — will have to begin very soon after the war.

This will require, among other things, for a number of countries the reconstitution, largely through importation, of stocks of many raw materials and basic foodstuffs, which will unquestionably be at a low point everywhere, and the acquisition of necessary machinery and other equipment. All this will call for a larger volume of means of foreign payment than practically any country of Europe and Asia will possess for some time.

The meeting of these needs will also involve many complex and difficult problems for our country and for those other areas which will be in a position to supply the necessary resources. The task of aiding in the reconstruction of other countries will be superimposed upon the task of these countries' own demobilization and of reconversion of their own production from military to peaceful ends.

These phases of the demobilization process will naturally extend over periods which will vary from country to country. But they will, in all cases, be also the initial phases of the longer-range reconstruction process. The policies pursued in connection with both processes should, therefore, be carefully and closely integrated from the point of view of basic objectives and of the best means of attaining those objectives. If we want to make sure, this time, that post-war reconstruction policies will really be directed toward winning the peace, we must make sure that the cessation of armed hostilities will not be followed by a continuation of economic warfare.

Lack of determination to abandon the policies and practices of economic warfare will be the greatest danger that can confront us after the war. Plenty of reasons for continuing such policies and practices will be advanced, as they were after the last war. Yet it will not matter whether economic warfare will be employed in the post-war era for selfish and predatory reasons; or as an instrument of other policies; or on the basis of a defeatist acceptance of what appears to be the line of least resistance; or as an inevitable consequence of action based on the theory that the solution of the problems of economic stability, full employment and rising living standards can and should be sought predominantly, or even solely, in terms of national economies and of domestic measures and controls, and that the resultant sacrifice of foreign trade should be accepted as inconsequential. In all cases, it will lead only to economic stagnation or worse.

Hence, while doing everything that is necessary to win the war, no effort should be spared to develop, in our country and in all countries which are now embattled against the forces of conquest, a firm determination to follow resolutely a course which would bring us to economic peace, and to chart that course well ahead of the time when we shall have to face the problems of post-war reconstruction.

There is no mystery as to the nature of the economic problems which will confront us after the war. In the international field, apart from making adequate preparation for handling the immediate problems of relief and demobilization, some of the more important ones will be as follows:

1. To rebuild the machinery of sound international commercial relations by dealing with such problems as import restrictions, non-discriminatory treatment, access to raw materials, commodity agreements, export subsidies, indirect protectionism, shipping, etc

2. To create appropriate arrangements for the stabilization of foreign-exchange rates and for encouraging freedom of foreign-exchange transactions, including such problems as the role of gold and the use of other monetary techniques.

3. To create effective machinery of international credit and investment, designed to promote the functioning of international trade, the establishment and maintenance of monetary stability, the development of the world's resources, and the assurance of a timely and adequate flow of funds from financially stronger to financially weaker countries for the purpose of assisting them in reducing the amplitude of economic fluctuations, and thereby contributing to general economic stability, and to bring about, where necessary, adjustment of existing international obligations.

4. To set up other necessary mechanisms for implementing the various phases of economic collaboration among nations, as regards both international coordination of domestic policies and measures, without agreement on both of which no satisfactory solution is possible for the crucial problems of economic stability, full employment, and rising living standards.

Action in all these fields must be initiated as speedily as possible after the termination of hostilities. It obviously cannot be completed overnight. It must be of a continuing and progressive character and must necessarily proceed through a series of step-by-step adjustments. What is clearly needed, therefore, is agreement among the nations on broad objectives, and utmost care in choosing transitional policies in such a way that they will facilitate rather than retard or even render impossible the attainment of these objectives.

Important steps have already been taken to this end.

For several months an Allied Committee has been at work in London on the problem of post-war relief requirements. Many countries, including ours, are represented on that Committee.

In November the International Labor Conference in New York decided to create an international committee for the study of post-war economic problems. Like the International Labor Organization itself, the committee has tripartite representation — government, labor, and employers.

The Rio de Janeiro Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, in January, decided to convoke an Inter-American Technical Economic Conference to consider programs for post-war reconstruction. Preparation for this conference has been entrusted to the Inter-American Economic and Financial Advisory Committee, which has been in continuous session in Washington for over two years.

Last week a far-reaching agreement was signed in Washington between Great Britain and ourselves, setting forth the principles which are to govern the final settlement of obligations resulting from our Lend-Lease aid to Britain.¹ That agreement contains, in its Article VII, the following provision which is of enormous significance for the post-war period:

.

[Here follows text of the provision]

The decision of the two Governments to engage in consultations along the lines of the first paragraph of this provision and to seek agreement on these matters with the governments of all other like-minded nations marks tremendous progress toward effective implementation of the economic objectives and the high social aims of the Atlantic Declaration.

All appropriate departments and agencies of our Government are hard at work in their respective fields on problems of the future as well as of the present. Throughout the war we have continued, wherever possible, to negotiate mutually beneficial reciprocal trade agreements and thus to keep alive, as a powerful instrument of post-war action, a policy which has proved in the past so important a factor in the promotion of economic peace. The International Wheat Meeting, which has been at work in Washington for several months, is attempting to find a solution for one of the most troublesome commodity problems. Many private groups in the country are giving hard thought to the problems of the future and are cooperating splendidly with the Government.

¹ See section United Nations, p. 10.

All these are significant steps toward laying a foundation of economic peace for the post-war period. As time goes on, others undoubtedly will be undertaken. There is more than a good chance that we shall emerge from this war with the techniques for economic peace reasonably well worked out and ready to be applied. Whether or not these techniques will actually be translated into a functioning machinery of economic peace will depend overwhelmingly upon whether or not the people of our country and of other countries will have a clear understanding of the issues at stake and the necessary resolution to act on that understanding.

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 210-22.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Report to Congress on the First Year¹ of Lend-Lease Operations, March 11, 1942

Chapter IV: Master Agreements and Reciprocal Aid

On February 23, 1942, the master agreement between Great Britain and the United States was signed, an event which the Under Secretary of State declared to be the first important milestone on the road toward achievement of the objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter. The form and terms of this agreement represent the culmination of many months of study and negotiation, and the solution they foreshadow promises to contribute substantially to the post-war reconstruction in which the United States has so large a political and economic stake.

Under the British agreement, the United States receives several kinds of direct benefit in return for its aid to Britain.

The first, both before our entry into the war and emphatically since December 7, 1941, is the military contribution to American security which flows from the continued British fight against the Axis. To assure this benefit to America has, of course, been at all times the basic purpose and motive of the Act.

The second of the benefits provided for in the agreement is the increased flow of reciprocal aid which we are receiving from Britain and the other members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. . . .

Lend-lease, therefore, is not a one-way street. . . . The lend-lease master agreements recognize the principle that signatory nations will make available to the United States such defense information and material as they are in a position to supply. . . .

¹ Fourth ninety-day report.

The third direct benefit received in return for our aid is an understanding with Britain (and prospectively with others of our allies) as to the shape of future commercial and financial policy. Article VII of the Agreement of February 23, 1942, pledges the signatories to work collectively. . . .¹

The basic lend-lease master agreement with Great Britain is more comprehensive than those that were signed before it, and is expected to have great influence on the further development of master agreement policy. Thirteen master compacts have been executed in addition to the British agreement.²

Insofar as differing economic and political circumstances permit, it is expected that good will and self-interest will soon lead to the negotiation of uniform and comprehensive master agreements among the United Nations, laying a foundation for future action designed to fulfill the victory and safeguard the peace.

Aid under the Act of March 11, 1941, has proved to be a weapon of great scope, with surprising capacity for cutting through barriers of convention and delay. It is an integral part of the process of pooling economic and military resources which dominates United Nations war policy. More than that, the arrangements effected under the lend-lease program may contribute profoundly to post-war economic and financial stability, and the master agreements declaring the policy of the United States in this area make lend-lease a part of a coherent plan for reconstructing and revitalizing the world economy.

A Report on the First Year of Lend-Lease Operations, March 11, 1942 (House Doc. No. 661, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), p. 31-5.

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State: Speech at the Greek Independence Day Dinner of the American Friends of Greece, New York, March 25, 1942

But justice requires more than dealing with the guilty. It must include relief, assistance and reconstruction of the life of Greece. In honor and in humanity we can do no less.

Greece will not die. She could not, indeed; for there is more of western life and western hope in a handful of dust on the Acropolis than in all

¹ See p. 12.

² See section United Nations, p. 10.

the makeshift religions, philosophies and new orders that have come from the diseased brains in Berlin. From the example of Greece the United Nations must draw increased devotion to their declared ideal of preserving liberty, independence and religious freedom, and of setting up once more a world in which human rights and justice are the foundation of the law of the earth.

We are resolved that there shall be no compromise in this present struggle. What Greece could do, we all must do. If we never know what peace is in our lifetime, we propose nevertheless that the light which came into Europe, and from Europe to the Americas, from the lamps of the Acropolis, from the tragedies of Euripides, from the songs of Menander, from the thought of Aristotle, from the science of Archimedes — that light will not go out.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 81; *D. S. Bul.*, VI, p. 257.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Address to Members of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union, April 14, 1942

. . . My own thought is that perhaps there is one word that we could use for this war, the word "survival." The Survival War. That is what it comes pretty close to being: the survival of our civilization, the survival of democracy, the survival of a hemisphere — the newest hemisphere of all of them — which has developed in its own ways. On the surface these ways may be a bit different, but down at the bottom there is the same kind of civilization that has come from a love of liberty and the willingness to pioneer. So I think that survival is what our problem is, survival of what we have all lived for for a great many generations. . . .

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 355-6.

Henry A. Wallace, Vice-President: Address before the Free World Association, New York City, May 8, 1942

We, who in a formal or an informal way represent most of the free peoples of the world, are met here tonight in the interests of the millions in all the nations who have freedom in their souls. To my mind this meeting has just one purpose — to let those millions in other countries know that here in the United States are 130 million men, women and children who are in this war to the finish. Our American people are utterly resolved to go on until they can strike the relentless blows that will assure a complete victory, and with it win a new day for the lovers of freedom, everywhere on this earth.

This is a fight between a slave world and a free world. Just as the United States in 1862 could not remain half slave and half free, so in 1942 the world must make its decision for a complete victory one way or the other.

As we begin the final stages of this fight to the death between the free world and the slave world, it is worth-while to refresh our minds about the march of freedom for the common man. The idea of freedom — the freedom that we in the United States know and love so well — is derived from the Bible with its extraordinary emphasis on the dignity of the individual. Democracy is the only true political expression of Christianity.

The prophets of the Old Testament were the first to preach social justice. But that which was sensed by the prophets many centuries before Christ was not given complete and powerful political expression until our nation was formed as a Federal Union a century and a half ago. Even then, the march of the common people had just begun. Most of them did not yet know how to read and write. There were no public schools to which all children could go. Men and women can not be really free until they have plenty to eat, and time and ability to read and think and talk things over. Down the years, the people of the United States have moved steadily forward in the practice of democracy. Through universal education, they now can read and write and form opinions of their own. They have learned, and are still learning, the art of production — that is, how to make a living. They have learned, and are still learning, the art of self-government.

If we were to measure freedom by standards of nutrition, education and self-government, we might rank the United States and certain nations of Western Europe very high. But this would not be fair to other nations where education has become widespread only in the last 20 years. In many nations, a generation ago, 9 out of 10 of the people could not read or write. Russia, for example, was changed from an illiterate to a literate nation within one generation and, in the process, Russia's appreciation of freedom was enormously enhanced. In China, the increase during the past 30 years in the ability of the people to read and write has become matched by their increased interest in real liberty.

Everywhere, reading and writing are accompanied by industrial progress, and industrial progress sooner or later inevitably brings a strong labor movement. From a long-time and fundamental point of view, there are no backward peoples which are lacking in mechanical sense. Russians, Chinese, and the Indians both of India and the Americas all learn to read and write and operate machines just as well as your chil-

dren and my children. Everywhere the common people are on the march. Thousands of them are learning to read and write, learning to think together, learning to use tools. These people are learning to think and work together in labor movements, some of which may be extreme or impractical at first, but which eventually will settle down to serve effectively the interest of the common man.

When the freedom-loving people march — when the farmers have an opportunity to buy land at reasonable prices and to sell the produce of their land through their own organizations, when workers have the opportunity to form unions and bargain through them collectively, and when the children of all the people have an opportunity to attend schools which teach them truths of the real world in which they live — when these opportunities are open to everyone, then the world moves straight ahead.

But in countries where the ability to read and write has been recently acquired or where the people have had no long experience in governing themselves on the basis of their own thinking, it is easy for demagogues to arise and prostitute the mind of the common man to their own base ends. . . .

Through the leaders of the Nazi revolution, Satan now is trying to lead the common man of the whole world back into slavery and darkness. For the stark truth is that the violence preached by the Nazis is the devil's own religion of darkness. So also is the doctrine that one race or one class is by heredity superior and that all other races or classes are supposed to be slaves. The belief in one Satan-inspired Fuehrer, with his Quislings, his Laval, and his Mussolinis — his "gauleiters" in every nation in the world — is the last and ultimate darkness. Is there any hell hotter than that of being a Quisling, unless it is that of being a Laval or a Mussolini?

.

The march of freedom of the past 150 years has been a long-drawn-out people's revolution. In this Great Revolution of the people, there were the American Revolution of 1775, the French Revolution of 1792, the Latin-American Revolutions of the Bolivarian era, the German Revolution of 1848, and the Russian Revolution of 1918. Each spoke for the common man in terms of blood on the battlefield. Some went to excess. But the significant thing is that the people groped their way to the light. More of them learned to think and work together.

The people's revolution aims at peace and not at violence, but if the rights of the common man are attacked, it unleashes the ferocity of a she-bear who has lost a cub. When the Nazi psychologists tell their

master Hitler that we in the United States may be able to produce hundreds of thousands of planes, but that we have no will to fight, they are only fooling themselves and him. The truth is that when the rights of the American people are transgressed, as those rights have been transgressed, the American people will fight with a relentless fury which will drive the ancient Teutonic gods back cowering into their caves. The *Götterdämmerung* has come for Odin and his crew.

The people are on the march toward even fuller freedom than the most fortunate peoples of the earth have hitherto enjoyed. No Nazi counter-revolution will stop it. The common man will smoke the Hitler stooges out into the open in the United States, in Latin America, and in India. He will destroy their influence. No Lavals, no Mussolinis will be tolerated in a Free World.

The people in their millennial and revolutionary march toward manifesting here on earth the dignity that is in every human soul, hold as their credo the Four Freedoms enunciated by President Roosevelt in his message to Congress on January 6, 1941. These Four Freedoms are the very core of the revolution for which the United States have taken their stand. We who live in the United States may think there is nothing very revolutionary about freedom of religion, freedom of expression, and freedom from the fear of secret police. But when we begin to think about the significance of freedom from want for the average man, then we know that the revolution of the past 150 years has not been completed, either here in the United States or in any other nation in the world. We know that this revolution can not stop until freedom from want has actually been attained.

And now, as we move forward toward realizing the Four Freedoms of this people's revolution, I would like to speak about four duties. It is my belief that every freedom, every right, every privilege has its price, its corresponding duty without which it can not be enjoyed. The four duties of the people's revolution, as I see them today, are these:

1. The duty to produce to the limit.
2. The duty to transport as rapidly as possible to the field of battle.
3. The duty to fight with all that is in us.
4. The duty to build a peace — just, charitable and enduring.

The fourth duty is that which inspires the other three. We failed in our job after World War No. 1. We did not know how to go about it to build an enduring world-wide peace. We did not have the nerve to follow through and prevent Germany from rearming. We did not insist that she "learn war no more." We did not build a peace treaty on the fundamental doctrine of the people's revolution. We did not strive

wholeheartedly to create a world where there could be freedom from want for all the peoples. But by our very errors we learned much, and after this war we shall be in position to utilize our knowledge in building a world which is economically, politically and, I hope, spiritually sound.

Modern science, which is a by-product and an essential part of the people's revolution, has made it technologically possible to see that all of the people of the world get enough to eat . . . The peace must mean a better standard of living for the common man, not merely in the United States and England, but also in India, Russia, China and Latin America — not merely in the United Nations, but also in Germany and Italy and Japan.

Some have spoken of the "American Century." I say that the century on which we are entering — the century which will come out of this war — can be and must be the century of the common man. Perhaps it will be America's opportunity to suggest the freedoms and duties by which the common man must live. Everywhere the common man must learn to build his own industries with his own hands in a practical fashion. Everywhere the common man must learn to increase his productivity so that he and his children can eventually pay to the world community all that they have received. No nation will have the God-given right to exploit other nations. Older nations will have the privilege to help younger nations get started on the path to industrialization, but there must be neither military nor economic imperialism. The methods of the nineteenth century will not work in the people's century which is now about to begin. India, China, and Latin America have a tremendous stake in the people's century. As their masses learn to read and write, and as they become productive mechanics, their standard of living will double and treble. Modern science, when devoted wholeheartedly to the general welfare, has in it potentialities of which we do not yet dream.

And modern science must be released from German slavery. International cartels that serve American greed and the German will to power must go. Cartels in the peace to come must be subjected to international control for the common man, as well as being under adequate control by the respective home governments. In this way, we can prevent the Germans from again building a war machine while we sleep. With international monopoly pools under control, it will be possible for inventions to serve all the people instead of only the few.

Yes, and when the time of peace comes, the citizen will again have a duty, the supreme duty of sacrificing the lesser interest for the greater interest of the general welfare. Those who write the peace must think

of the whole world. There can be no privileged peoples. We ourselves in the United States are no more a master race than the Nazis. And we can not perpetuate economic warfare without planting the seeds of military warfare. We must use our power at the peace table to build an economic peace that is just, charitable and enduring.

If we really believe that we are fighting for a people's peace, all the rest becomes easy. Production, yes — it will be easy to get production without either strikes or sabotage; production with the wholehearted cooperation between willing arms and keen brains; enthusiasm, zip, energy geared to the tempo of keeping at it everlastingly day after day. Hitler knows as well as those of us who sit in on the War Production Board meetings that we here in the United States are winning the battle of production. He knows that both labor and business in the United States are doing a most remarkable job and that his only hope is to crash through to a complete victory sometime during the next six months.

And then there is the task of transportation to the line of battle by truck, by railroad car, by ship. We shall joyously deny ourselves so that our transportation system is improved by at least 30 per cent. I need say little about the duty to fight. Some people declare, and Hitler believes, that the American people have grown soft in the last generation. Hitler agents continually preach in South America that we are cowards, unable to use, like the "brave" German soldiers, the weapons of modern war. It is true that American youth hate war with a holy hatred. But because of that fact and because Hitler and the German people stand as the very symbol of war, we shall fight with a tireless enthusiasm until war and the possibility of war have been removed from this planet. We shall cleanse the plague spot of Europe, which is Hitler's Germany, and with it the hell-hole of Asia — Japan.

The American people have always had guts and always will have. . . .

The American fighting men, and all the fighting men of the United Nations, will need to summon all their courage during the next few months. . . .

There can be no half measures. North, South, East, West and Middle-west — the will of the American people is for complete victory. No compromise with Satan is possible. We shall not rest until all the victims under the Nazi yoke are freed. We shall fight for a complete peace as well as a complete victory.

The people's revolution is on the march, and the devil and all his angels can not prevail against it. They can not prevail, for on the side of the people is the Lord.

"He giveth power to the faint; to them that have no might
He increaseth strength . . . They that wait upon the Lord
shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not
be weary; they shall walk and not be faint."

Strong in the strength of the Lord, we who fight in the people's cause
will never stop until that cause is won.

Free World, 1942, III, p. 9; reprinted by Government
Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

***Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Statement Made in Connection with
the Celebration of National Foreign Trade Week, May 17, 1942***

.

When the war is over, enduring peace and advancing prosperity will
be impossible unless international trade and international economic re-
lations in general are established on the basis of fair treatment and mu-
tual benefit. Our war effort itself will be immensely strengthened if we
make sure now that one of the principal things we are fighting for is the
establishment of a new and better system of international economic
relations.

The United Nations have already resolved that once victory is
achieved the economic relations among nations will be based on the
principles and objectives which have been tirelessly advocated by our
Government on all appropriate occasions in recent years. These prin-
ciples and objectives have been affirmed and incorporated in the declara-
tion of August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter. They have
been accepted as a common program by all our allies in the United Na-
tions Declaration of January 1, 1942.

.

The far-reaching economic objectives of the Atlantic Charter cannot
be attained by wishful thinking. We in this country must realize that
their achievement will be impossible if we follow policies of narrow eco-
nomic nationalism, such as our extreme and disastrous tariff policy after
the last war. We must realize that our own prosperity depends fully as
much on prosperous conditions in other countries as their prosperity
depends on ours. We must show now by our positive acts of collabora-
tion with other nations of like mind that we are prepared to shoulder
our full share of responsibility for building a better world. . . .

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 478-9; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 69.

*Milo Perkins, Executive Director of the Board of Economic Warfare:
Speech at Commencement, Swarthmore College, May 25, 1942*

We are engaged in a struggle that transcends the present war. This is a long, long fight to make a mass-production economy work. The battle started when machines became important in the lives of men. It should be over within the generation following this conflict. The battle will be won when we have built up mass-consumption to a point where markets can absorb the output of our mass-production industries running at top speed. Then, so far as our physical needs are concerned, life can become a journey to be enjoyed rather than a battle to be fought.

Our minds are now creating neat little time compartments labeled prewar, war and post-war but these are like the labels of childhood, youth and manhood to the individual who lives through them. This is a single and continuous struggle to achieve one goal. Complete victory will not be won until there is a full and increasing use of the world's resources to lift living standards from one end of this planet to the other.

Better than half of our industrial output at the end of this war will be going to one customer — our own government. The business will exceed 70 billion dollars a year. Any attempt to stop that purchasing power abruptly would result in complete bankruptcy. There must be a gradual and sensible unwinding. Government must encourage business to regain its peace-time markets as fast as it can and business must encourage government to taper off its activities slowly enough to keep production going full blast. The heavy demand for civilian goods in the immediate post-war period will make it easier to accomplish this transition.

Capital investment in heavy goods for reconstruction must replace capital investment in armaments at a rate adequate to maintain full employment.

Full-blast production for a gradually rising standard of living will be as necessary to win the peace as all-out production now is to win the war. It will be physically possible. Our number one post-war job will be to make it fiscally possible. If we can do that, private enterprise will enter upon an era of unparalleled activity.

The greatest untapped markets industrial capitalism has ever known will open up before us. Their development will be the one hope for our profit system. Industrial capitalism cannot survive without those mar-

kets. Of course it won't be easy. There will be complicated distribution problems to be worked out. There will be the problem of how to get purchasing power into the hands of potential customers so they can become real customers. There will be the problem of how to develop a peace-time job for every displaced worker in our armament industries. It will be hard but it won't be any tougher than winning this war.

The plain people of this earth know what they want in the post-war period. Above all else they want to be *wanted*; they want a chance to work and be useful. They want an income which will give them enough food and clothing, shelter and medical care to drive the fear of want from the family fireside. And they want these simple things within a society that guarantees their civil liberties. . . .

The job of the future will be to build up a mass consumption great enough to use this mass production. That will require a bold and daring use of long-term credits by every enlightened government of the world. Governments must enter fields where private finance cannot enter without assuming risks that are too great to take with other people's money. By that very act, however, the area of private investment will be broader and safer than it was in the last two decades. A world at work at decent wages is a world of economic stability. Idleness is the greatest of all threats to confidence.

Of course there are changes ahead but this evolutionary progress need not destroy our system of private enterprise. On the contrary, those changes can provide an environment in which industrial capitalism can be strengthened enormously. We have it in us to measure up to this job of maintaining full employment. The war is toughening us for the greatest conquest men have ever faced — the conquest of backwardness and unnecessary poverty. We are learning to live like men who are conquerors to the core.

What does all this mean to us as individuals? It means that our personal fortunes will be tied to what happens to groups of other men in this world as those fortunes never were in the past. It means that what today does to us as individuals is probably not very important. What is important is what we do with tomorrow by way of keeping the whole world at work on all-out production for a century to come. If we can lose ourselves wholeheartedly in that job, we shall find personal completeness as men have never found it before.

If we cannot, the tides of life will leave us to one side; we shall become isolated in a world where men are growing closer to each other.

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State: Memorial Day Address at the Arlington National Amphitheater, May 30, 1942

.

And after we win the victory — and we will — what then? Will the people of the United States make certain that those who have died that we may live as free men and women shall not have died in vain?

I believe that in such cases the voice of those who are doing the fighting, and the voice of those who are producing the arms with which we fight must be heard, and must be heeded.

And I believe that these voices of the men who will make our victory possible will demand that justice be done, inexorable and swiftly to those individuals, groups or peoples, as the case may be, that can truly be held accountable for the stupendous catastrophe into which they have plunged the human race. But I believe they will likewise wish to make certain that no element in any nation shall be forced to atone vicariously for crimes for which it is not responsible, and that no people shall be forced to look forward to endless years of want and of starvation.

I believe they will require that the victorious nations, joined with the United States, undertake forthwith during the period of the armistice the disarmament of all nations, as set forth in the Atlantic Charter, which "may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers."

I believe they will insist that the United Nations undertake the maintenance of an international police power in the years after the war to insure freedom from fear to peaceloving peoples until there is established that permanent system of general security promised by the Atlantic Charter.

Finally, I believe they will demand that the United Nations become the nucleus of a world organization of the future to determine the final terms of a just, an honest and a durable peace to be entered into after the passing of the period of social and economic chaos which will come inevitably upon the termination of the present war, and after the completion of the initial and gigantic task of relief, of reconstruction and of rehabilitation which will confront the United Nations at the time of the armistice.

This is in very truth a people's war. It is a war which cannot be regarded as won until the fundamental rights of the peoples of the earth are secured. In no other manner can a true peace be achieved.

In the pre-war world large numbers of people were unemployed; the living standards of millions of people were pitifully low; it was a world

of "haves" and "have nots," with all that these words imply in terms of inequity and hatred.

.

The problem which will confront us when the years of the post-war period are reached is not primarily one of production. For the world can readily produce what mankind requires. The problem is rather one of distribution and purchasing power; of providing the mechanism whereby what the world produces may be fairly distributed among the nations of the world, and of providing the means, whereby the people of the world may obtain the world's goods and services. Your government has already taken steps to obtain the support and active cooperation of others of the United Nations in this great task; a task which in every sense of the term is a new frontier — a frontier of limitless expanse — a frontier of human welfare.

When the war ends with the resultant exhaustion which will then beset so many of the nations who are joined with us, only the United States will have the strength and the resources to lead the world out of the slough in which it has struggled so long; to lead the way toward a world order in which there can be freedom from want. In seeking this end we will, of course, respect the right of all peoples to determine for themselves the type of internal economic organization which is best suited to their circumstances. But I believe that here in our own country we will continue to find the best expression for our own and the general good under a system which will give the greatest incentive and opportunity for individual enterprise. It is in such an environment that our citizens have made this country strong and great. Given sound national policies directed toward the benefit of the majority, and not of the minority, and real security and equality of opportunity for all, reliance on the ingenuity, initiative and enterprise of our citizens rather than on any form of bureaucratic management will in the future best assure the liberties and promote the material welfare of our people.

In taking thought of our future opportunities we surely must undertake to preserve the advantages we have gained in the past. I cannot believe that peoples of the United States, and of the Western Hemisphere, will ever relinquish the inter-American system they have built up. Based as it is on sovereign equality, on liberty, on peace and on joint resistance to aggression, it constitutes the only example in the world today of a regional federation of free and independent peoples. It lightens the darkness of our anarchic world. It should constitute a cornerstone in the world structure of the future.

If this war is in fact a war for the liberation of peoples it must assure the sovereign equality of peoples throughout the world, as well as in the world of the Americas. Our victory must bring in its train the liberation of all peoples. Discrimination between peoples because of their race, creed or color must be abolished. The age of imperialism is ended. The right of a people to their freedom must be recognized, as the civilized world long since recognized the right of an individual to his personal freedom. The principles of the Atlantic Charter must be guaranteed to the world as a whole — in all oceans and in all continents.

And so, in the fullness of God's time when the victory is won, the people of the United States will once more be afforded the opportunity to play their part in the determination of the kind of world in which they will live. With courage and with vision they can yet secure the future safety of their country and of its free institutions, and help the nations of the earth back into the paths of peace.

Then, on some future Memorial Day, the American people, as they mark the graves of those who died in battle for their country in these last two world wars, can at last truly say: "Sleep on in quiet and in peace; the victory you made it possible for us to win has now been placed at the service of your country and of humanity; your sacrifice has not been made in vain."

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 485-9; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 71.

John G. Winant, Ambassador to the United Kingdom: Speech to the Miners' Association at Durham, England, June 6, 1942

We must move on a great social offensive if we are to win the war completely. Anti-Fascism is not a short-term military job. It was bred in poverty and unemployment. To crush Fascism at its roots we must crush depression.

The world of today and tomorrow demands courage. . . . We have the courage to defeat poverty as we are defeating Fascism and we must translate it into action with the same urgency and unity of purpose that we have won from our comradeship in this war.

What we want is not complicated. We have enough technical knowledge and organizing ability to respond to this awakening of social conscience. We have enough courage. We must put it to use. When the war is done, the drive for tanks must become a drive for houses. The

drive for food to prevent the enemy from starving us must become a drive for food to satisfy the needs of all people in all countries. The drive for physical fitness in the forces must become a drive for bringing death and sickness rates in the whole population down to the lowest possible level. The drive for manpower in war must become a drive for employment to make freedom from want a living reality. The drive for an all-out war effort by the United Nations must become a drive for an all-out peace effort based on the same cooperation and willingness to sacrifice.

These are only some of the basic things we want. It is not beyond our technical or spiritual capacity to have them. Just as the peoples of democracy are united in a common objective today, so we are committed to a common objective tomorrow. We are committed to the establishment of service to democracy. This is the democracy that brought Britain through the blitzes. This is the democracy that is manning our forces. This is the democracy that is bringing ships, planes, tanks and guns in growing volume from your factories and from ours. This is the peoples' democracy. We must keep it wide and vigorous, alive to need of whatever kind and ready to meet it whether it be danger from without or well-being from within, always remembering that it is the things of the spirit that in the end prevail, that caring counts; that where there is no vision people perish; that hope and faith count and that without charity there can be nothing good. That daring to live dangerously, we are learning to live generously and believing in the inherent goodness of man we may meet the call of your great Prime Minister and "stride forward into the unknown with growing confidence."

Toward New Horizons, Office of War Information,
Washington, p. 12.

***Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Letter to Congress Transmitting the
Fifth Report on Operations under the Lend-Lease Act, June 11, 1942***

.

By combined action now, we can preserve freedom and restore peace to our peoples. By combined action later we can fulfill the victory we have joined to attain. The concept of the United Nations will not perish on the battlefields of this terrible war. It will live to lay the basis of the enduring world understanding on which mankind depends to preserve its peace and its freedom.

Fifth Ninety-Day Report . . . (House Doc. No. 799,
77th Cong., 2d sess.).

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Fifth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations: Lend-Lease and Peace, June 11, 1942

The lend-lease program has already become a prime mechanism in the combined efforts the United Nations are making to win the war. The program of lend-lease agreements is also emerging as a factor in the combined effort of the United Nations to weave a pattern for peace. Those agreements are taking shape as key instruments of national policy, the first of our concrete steps in the direction of affirmative post-war reconstruction.

The agreement with Great Britain was signed on February 23, 1942. On June 2, 1942, an agreement was made with the Republic of China embodying the same terms.¹ On June 11, 1942, a similar agreement was signed with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The provisions of these agreements are now being offered to our other allies receiving lend-lease assistance.

These basic lend-lease agreements place the problem of the peacetime settlement in a realistic and appropriate setting. The agreements postpone final determination of the lend-lease account until "the extent of the defense aid is known and until the progress of events makes clearer the final terms and conditions and benefits which will be in the mutual interests" of the signatory nations, and which "will promote the establishment and maintenance of world peace." Final settlement has been postponed since the course of the war may further change the complexion of the issue.

We are now in the war, as we were not in March 1941 when the Lend-Lease Act was passed. We have pledged our resources without limit to win the war, and the peace which will follow it. We look forward to a period of security and liberty, in which men may freely pursue lives of their choice, and governments will achieve policies leading to full and useful production and employment. If the promise of the peace is to be fulfilled, a large volume of production and trade among nations must be restored and sustained. This trade must be solidly founded on stable exchange relationships and liberal principles of commerce. The lend-lease settlement will rest on a specific and detailed program for achieving these ends, which are, as Article VII of the agreements with Great Britain, China and Russia points out, "the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples."

Cooperative action among the United Nations is contemplated to fulfill this program for economic progress, in the many spheres where ac-

¹ See section United Nations, p. 10.

tion is needed. It is hoped that plans will soon develop for a series of agreements and recommendations for legislation, in the fields of commercial policy, of money and finance, international investment and reconstruction.

Article VII of each of the basic agreements pledges that "the terms and conditions" of the final determination of the benefits to be provided the United States in return for aid furnished under the Act "shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations." By this provision we have affirmatively declared our intention to avoid the political and economic mistakes of international debt experienced during the twenties.

A lend-lease settlement which fulfills this principle will be sound from the economic point of view. But it will have a greater merit. It will represent the only fair way to distribute the financial costs of war among the United Nations.

The real costs of the war cannot be measured, nor compared, nor paid for in money. They must and are being met in blood and toil. But the financial costs of the war can and should be met in a way which will serve the needs of lasting peace and mutual economic well-being.

All the United Nations are seeking maximum conversion to war production, in the light of their special resources. If each country devotes roughly the same fraction of its national production to the war, then the financial burden of war is distributed equally among the United Nations in accordance with their ability to pay. And although the nations richest in resources are able to make larger contributions, the claim of war against each is relatively the same. Such a distribution of the financial costs of war means that no nation will grow rich from the war effort of its allies. The money costs of the war will fall according to the rule of equality in sacrifice, as in effort.

Fifth Ninety-Day Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations,
House Doc. No. 799, 77th Cong., 2d sess., Chapter 3, p. 21-23.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Address on Flag Day, June 14, 1942

Today on Flag Day we celebrate the Declaration of the United Nations — that great alliance dedicated to the defeat of our foes and to the establishment of a true peace based on the freedom of man. . . .

The four freedoms of common humanity are as much elements of man's needs as air and sunlight, bread and salt. Deprive him of all these freedoms and he dies; deprive him of a part of them and a part of

him withers. Give them to him in full and abundant measure and he will cross the threshold of a new age, the greatest age of man.

These freedoms are the rights of men of every creed and every race, wherever they live. This is their heritage, long withheld. We of the United Nations have the power and the men and the will at last to assure man's heritage.

The belief in the four freedoms of common humanity — the belief in man, created free, in the image of God — is the crucial difference between ourselves and the enemies we face today. In it lies the absolute unity of our alliance, opposed to the oneness of the evil we hate. Here is our strength, the source and promise of victory.

We of the United Nations know that our faith cannot be broken by any man or any force. And we know that there are other millions who in their silent captivity share our belief.

We ask the German people, still dominated by their Nazi whipmasters, whether they would rather have the mechanized hell of Hitler's "New Order" or — in place of that — freedom of speech and religion, freedom from want and from fear.

We ask the Japanese people, trampled by their savage lords of slaughter, whether they would rather continue slavery and blood or, in place of them, freedom of speech and religion, freedom from want and from fear.

We ask the brave, unconquered people of the nations the Axis invaders have dishonored and despoiled whether they would rather yield to conquerors or have freedom of speech and religion, freedom from want and from fear.

We know the answer. They know the answer. We know that man, born to freedom in the image of God, will not forever suffer the oppressors' sword. The peoples of the United Nations are taking that sword from the oppressors' hands. With it they will destroy those tyrants. The brazen tyrannies pass. Man marches forward toward the light.

.

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 545; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 77.

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State: Speech at the United Nations Rally, Baltimore, June 17, 1942

.

. . . We can none of us again afford to forget the lessons we have learned: that cooperation to win the victory is not enough; that there must be even greater cooperation to win the peace, if the peace is to be

that kind of a peace which alone can prevent the recurrence of war — a peace which is more than a mere interlude between battles.

Without such cooperation we shall have again economic distress, unemployment, poverty, and suffering for millions of people — suffering, which while less acute is longer drawn out and is but little less hard to bear than the miseries of war; suffering, which as surely as night follows day is the breeder of wars.

In our conduct of the war we are all of us cooperating with confidence in each other — fully, completely. This form of partnership must obtain a momentum that will carry over into the post-war period. We must cultivate the habit.

The final terms of the peace should wait until the immediate tasks of the transition period after the defeat of the Axis Powers have been completed by the United Nations and until the final judgments can be coolly and rationally rendered.

But the organization through which the United Nations are to carry on their cooperation should surely be formed so far as practicable before the fires of war which are welding them together have cooled. Everything which can be done to this end before the war is over must be done. Every act or measure of cooperation among the United Nations must be scrutinized to see whether it cannot also be made to serve in the winning of the peace.

On June eleventh last this Government concluded a master lend-lease agreement with the Soviet Union which deals with the principles of mutual aid in the conduct of the war. In this agreement the United States and the Soviet Union undertake to continue to furnish each other with supplies, information, and services needed for the war effort to the full extent of their ability. The agreement thus deals with a matter of prime importance from the standpoint of the war effort.

But this agreement also looks forward to the peace. The agreement reaffirms adherence to the Atlantic Charter, and the two Governments pledge themselves to cooperate with each other and all other nations of like mind in a concerted and determined effort to promote the betterment of world-wide economic relations.

Article VII of the agreement¹ envisages international and domestic measures directed to the expansion of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples. The best means of attaining these and other objectives, such as the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce and the reduction of

¹ See section United Nations, p. 12.

tariffs and other trade barriers, will be the subject of continuing conversations between the two Governments.

Similar master lend-lease agreements have thus far been concluded with three other countries in addition to the Soviet Union: with Great Britain on February 23, 1942; with the Republic of China on June 2, 1942; and yesterday with Belgium. Thus, in effect, five of the world's great nations have become partners, with full equality of status, in a new world understanding — an economic understanding, open to the participation of all other nations of like mind; an economic understanding which may well become the nucleus of a United Nations organization for the relief and economic reconstruction of the post-war world.

During the difficult transition period between the end of the war and the final conclusion of peace there will be vital need for such an organization. Millions of the world's peoples will be homeless; in Europe and in Asia transportation systems will be ruined, production facilities destroyed, farms laid waste, cities devastated; we shall all of us be confronted with the gigantic task of converting to peacetime uses whole industries now producing munitions of war. There must be agreement upon the objectives to be attained; machinery for carrying out the agreed action of the United Nations; and cooperative effort of the highest order among all the United Nations, to which the oppressed peoples of the earth may look with hope when they have cast off their chains.

In these, our purposes and our endeavors, we in the United States are fortified by the knowledge that we may count upon the firm support and assistance of those of our neighbors of the New World who are not represented among the United Nations but who have severed all relations with the Axis Powers and who have thus refused to permit their territory to be utilized by agents of the tyrannies that have dared to attack the New World against their fellow Americans and against their own security. Eleven of the American Republics are now numbered among the United Nations. And in the supreme task of guarding the independence of the Western Hemisphere so that the liberties of all the peoples of the Americas may be secure we may well pay tribute tonight to the help and the encouragement which those of us engaged in war derive from all the many practical and generous forms of support offered us by the Governments and people of Brazil, of Colombia and Venezuela, of Peru and Ecuador, of Bolivia, Paraguay, and Uruguay.

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 548-50.

Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State: Speech on "Building in War for Peace" [Lend-Lease Agreements], Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, July 6, 1942

What is it, then, that we do want? I believe that it is what has been provided for in the agreements already made. If you ask yourselves and your neighbors what it is that you want, the answer will not be money, or to get back the guns you have sent abroad, or to get goods except in the course of trade. The answer will be that you want a chance to live fully and in peace. You want a world in which some half-mad man and his bigotted crew on the other side of the earth will not bring down your lives and your houses about your ears once every quarter century. You want opportunity, a job in which you can use your powers, a job which may not end any Saturday, one that will provide the material and spiritual means for a life which is not mere existence. You want a system where the inevitable hazards of life do not fall on those least able to bear them, where education and a chance to use it are open to talent.

The agreements open the way — and about the only way — in which these wants of every man and woman in every country can be more than wishes. They do not lay down a blueprint for the future. No man can do that now. They do not promise Utopia. But they chart the fundamental course in the field of economic policy which, if faithfully followed and supported by political organization to maintain peace, cannot fail to take us farther along the road than in recent years it has seemed possible to hope.

They provide first that the steps to be agreed upon between us and our allies shall be open to participation by all other countries of like mind. There are to be no exclusive arrangements, no excluded peoples among those who wish to work with us to the common goal. This is the principle of the Atlantic Charter embodied in the agreements — that there shall be equal access to the trade of the world and to its raw materials for all nations large and small, victors or vanquished. At the base of the whole settlement is to be fairness and equality, the rejection of special privileges and vindictive exclusions.

The second principle calls for united action by all nations, correlating for this purpose international and domestic measures, to expand production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods. No one, of course, can doubt that the opportunity for full and secure lives which the peoples of all countries demand, and rightly demand, and will insist upon having, is only possible through increased production, em-

ployment, and the movement and consumption of goods. But one can well doubt the possibility of achieving these goals unless there is unity of efforts of all nations. Too often in the past action in one country has been frustrated because at the same moment others have been moving in the opposite direction in their domestic policy. The second fundamental principle of the agreements is for common efforts on all fronts at the same time to expand production, employment, and consumption.

The third principle is the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce and the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers. It is plain to every one of you that at the end of this war there will be a need such as we have never known to move goods between nations — to feed and clothe and house millions whose consumption has for years been below minimum requirements, to restore devastation, to build and rebuild all the means of production, and, in the years beyond, to move that far greater volume of goods required by the standards we are determined to achieve. It is plain, also, that any such movement is utterly impossible if the nations or any important group of them continue to put impediments in the way, attempt to corner markets for themselves, or resort to devices of any sort to check the flow of goods and back it up upon its sources.

Throughout his whole public life Secretary Hull has striven tirelessly to make our own and all other peoples see the folly and the tragic end of such practices. Even when the shadow of war was lengthening over the world, he made desperate efforts to break the network of restrictions which were choking the production and the movement of goods. But peoples continued to believe that they could solve a world problem in isolation. The agreements declare as a basic principle that this cannot be done and will not again be attempted. They lay down as the course for agreed action, that along which Mr. Hull has so steadfastly pointed the way.

These are decisions which have been made in the course of war. I submit to you that they have been well and wisely made, that they bear within them the promise of a peace which shall dawn with hope. It will be a dawn long awaited by millions from whom hope will have been the only sacrifice not asked and freely given. But the dawn will come. Its promise is in your hands, in the hands of your fellow citizens, in the hands and thoughts and will of the people everywhere. Yours is the power and yours the responsibility — not at some future time, not in plans for the world after the war, but in what you think and do and want now.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message to a Mass Demonstration against Nazi Atrocities, Madison Square Garden, New York, July 17, 1942

... I express the confident hope that the Atlantic Charter and the just world order to be made possible by the triumph of the United Nations will bring the Jews and oppressed people in all lands the four freedoms which Christian and Jewish teachings have largely inspired.

N.Y.T., July 22, 1942.

*Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Address on "The War and Human Freedom," July 23, 1942*¹

The conflict now raging throughout the earth is not a war of nation against nation. It is not a local or regional war or even a series of such wars. On the side of our enemies, led and driven by the most ambitious, depraved, and cruel leaders in history, it is an attempt to conquer and enslave this country and every country. On our side, the side of the United Nations, it is, for each of us, a life-and-death struggle for the preservation of our freedom, our homes, our very existence. We are united in our determination to destroy the world-wide forces of ruthless conquest and brutal enslavement. Their defeat will restore freedom or the opportunity for freedom alike to all countries and all peoples.

.

II

We, Americans, are fighting today because we have been attacked. We are fighting, as I have said, to preserve our very existence. We and the other free peoples are forced into a desperate fight because we did not learn the lessons of which I have spoken. We are forced to fight because we ignored the simple but fundamental fact that the price of peace and of the preservation of right and freedom among nations is the acceptance of international responsibilities.

After the last war too many nations, including our own, tolerated, or participated in, attempts to advance their own interests at the expense of any system of collective security and of opportunity for all. Too many of us were blind to the evils which, thus loosed, created growing cancers within and among nations — political suspicions and hatreds; the race of armaments, first stealthy and then the subject of flagrant boasts; economic nationalism and its train of economic depression and misery; and finally the emergence from their dark places of the looters and thugs who found their opportunity in disorder and disaster. The

¹ Broadcast over all national radio networks.

shadow of a new war fell across the world. War began in 1931 when Japan invaded China.

From the time when the first signs of menace to the peace of the world appeared on the horizon, the Government of the United States strove increasingly to promote peace on the solid foundation of law, justice, non-intervention, non-aggression, and international collaboration. With growing insistence we advocated the principles of a broad and constructive world order in political, economic, social, moral, and intellectual relations among nations — principles which must constitute the foundation of any satisfactory future world order. We practiced these principles in our good-neighbor policy, which was applicable to every part of the earth and which we sought to apply not alone in the Western Hemisphere, but in the Pacific area, in Europe, and everywhere else as well.

When hostilities broke out and wars were declared, our Government made every honorable and feasible effort to prevent spread of the conflicts and to safeguard this country against being drawn into war. But danger increased all around us. . . .

Events have demonstrated beyond question that each of the Axis powers was bent on unlimited conquest. As time went on it became manifest that the United States and the whole Western Hemisphere were ultimate targets. . . .

Finally a realization that these plans and purposes created a state of imminent and acute danger to all remaining peaceful countries, especially to those of the Western Hemisphere, forced us to face the all-important question as to when and where the peaceful nations, including ours, should begin to resist the movements of military aggression in order to make such resistance most effective.

It was in these circumstances that our Government felt the compelling importance of adopting the policy of aid to Great Britain and to other nations which resisted aggression, as set forth in the Lease-Lend Act, submitted to Congress in January 1941. . . .

In December 1941, acting in concert, moving in harmony with their world-wide objective, all three [Germany, Italy and Japan] launched their assault against us, the spearhead of which was at Pearl Harbor, reasoning that to achieve victory they must conquer us, and to conquer us they must strike before we were prepared to resist successfully.

. . . That answer is being forged in the fighting spirit which now pervades the people of this country, in the will to victory of all the United Nations.

In this vast struggle, we, Americans, stand united with those who, like ourselves, are fighting for the preservation of their freedom; with those who are fighting to regain the freedom of which they have been brutally deprived; with those who are fighting for the opportunity to achieve freedom.

We have always believed — and we believe today — that all peoples, without distinction of race, color, or religion, who are prepared and willing to accept the responsibilities of liberty, are entitled to its enjoyment. We have always sought — and we seek today — to encourage and aid all who aspire to freedom to establish their right to it by preparing themselves to assume its obligations. We have striven to meet squarely our own responsibility in this respect — in Cuba, in the Philippines, and wherever else it has developed upon us. It has been our purpose in the past — and will remain our purpose in the future — to use the full measure of our influence to support attainment of freedom by all peoples who, by their acts, show themselves worthy of it and ready for it.

We, who have received from the preceding generations the priceless fruits of the centuries-old struggle for liberty, freely accept today the sacrifices which may be needed to pass on to our children an even greater heritage.

Our enemies confront us with armed might in every part of the globe. We cannot win this war by standing at our borders and limiting ourselves to beating off attacks. Air, submarine, and other forms of assault can be effectively defeated only if those attacked seek out and destroy the sources of attack. We shall send all the aid that we can to our gallant allies. And we shall seek out our enemies and attack them at any and every point of the globe at which the destruction of the Axis forces can be accomplished most effectively, most speedily, and most certainly.

We know the magnitude of the task before us. We know that its accomplishment will exact unlimited effort and unflinching courage. However long the road we shall press on to the final victory.

Temporary reverses must not and will not be the occasion for weakness and discouragement. On the contrary they are the signal for all true soldiers and patriots to strike back all the harder, with that superb resolution which never yields to force or threat of force.

Fighting as we are in self-defense, in self-preservation, we must make certain the defeat and destruction of the world-invading forces of Hitler and the Japanese war lords. To do this our people and the peoples of every one of the twenty-eight United Nations must make up their minds

to sacrifice time and substance and life itself to an extent unprecedented in past history.

International desperadoes like individual bandits will not abandon outlawry voluntarily. They will only be stopped by force.

III

With victory achieved our first concern must be for those whose sufferings have been almost beyond human endurance. When the armies of our enemies are beaten, the people of many countries will be starving and without means of procuring food; homeless and without means of building shelter; their fields scorched; their cattle slaughtered; their tools gone; their factories and mines destroyed; their roads and transport wrecked. Unknown millions will be far from their homes — prisoners of war, inmates of concentration camps, forced laborers in alien lands, refugees from battle, from cruelty, from starvation. Disease and danger of disease will lurk everywhere. In some countries confusion and chaos will follow the cessation of hostilities. Victory must be followed by swift and effective action to meet these pressing human needs.

At the same time all countries — those which will need relief and those more fortunate — will be faced with the immediate problems of transition from war to peace. War production must be transformed into production for the peacetime needs of mankind. In some countries the physical ravages of war must be repaired. In others, agriculture must be re-established. In all countries returning soldiers must find places in the work of peace. There will be enormous deficiencies of many kinds of goods. All countries, including ours, will need an immense volume of production. There will, therefore, exist vast opportunities for useful employment. The termination of the war effort will release, for use in peaceful pursuits, stirring enthusiasms, the aspirations and energies of youth, technical experience, and — in many industries — ample plants and abundance of tools. The compelling demands of war are revealing how great a supply of goods can be produced for national defense. The needs of peace should be no less compelling, though some of the means of meeting them must be different. Toward meeting these needs each and every nation should intensively direct its efforts to the creation of an abundance for peacetime life. This can only be achieved by a combination of individuals, the efforts of groups, and the efforts of nations. Governments can and must help to focus the energies by encouraging, coordinating, and aiding the efforts of individuals and groups.

During this period of transition the United Nations must continue to act in the spirit of cooperation which now underlies their war effort

— to supplement and make more effective the action of countries individually in reestablishing public order, in providing swift relief, in meeting the manifold problems of readjustment.

Beyond these there will lie before all countries the great constructive task of building human freedom and Christian morality on firmer and broader foundations than ever before. This task, too, will of necessity call for both national and international action

Within each nation liberty under law is an essential requirement of progress. The spirit of liberty, when deeply embedded in the minds and hearts of the people, is the most powerful remedy for racial animosities, religious intolerance, ignorance, and all the other evils which prevent men from uniting in a brotherhood of truly civilized existence. It inspires men to acquisition of knowledge and understanding. It is the only real foundation of political and social stability.

Liberty is more than a matter of political rights, indispensable as those rights are. In our own country we have learned from bitter experience that to be truly free, men must have, as well, economic freedom and economic security — the assurance for all alike of an opportunity to work as free men in the company of free men; to obtain through work the material and spiritual means of life; to advance through the exercise of ability, initiative, and enterprise; to make provision against the hazards of human existence. We know that this is true of mankind everywhere. We know that in all countries there has been — and there will be increasingly in the future — demand for a forward movement of social justice. Each of us must be resolved that, once the war is won, this demand shall be met as speedily and as fully as possible. All these advances — in political freedom, in economic betterment, in social justice, in spiritual values — can be achieved by each nation primarily through its own work and effort, mainly through its own wise policies and actions. They can be made only where there is acceptance and cultivation of the concepts and the spirit of human rights and human freedom. It is impossible for any nation or group of nations to prescribe the methods or provide the means by which any other nation can accomplish or maintain its own political and economic independence, be strong, prosper, and attain high spiritual goals. It is possible, however, for all nations to give and to receive help.

That which nations can and must do toward helping one another is to take, by cooperative action, steps for the elimination of impediments and obstructions which prevent the full use by each — for the welfare of its people — of the energy and resources which are at its command. And the nations can and must, again by cooperative action under com-

mon agreement, create such facilities as will enable each to increase the effectiveness of its own national efforts.

Such cooperative action is already under way. Twenty-eight United Nations have proclaimed their adherence to a program of principles and purposes by which mankind may advance toward higher standards of national and international conduct. That program is embodied in the Declaration made on August 14, 1941, by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, now known as the Atlantic Charter.

The pledge of the Atlantic Charter is of a system which will give every nation, large or small, a greater assurance of stable peace, greater opportunity for the realization of its aspirations to freedom, and greater facilities for material advancement. But that pledge implies an obligation for each nation to demonstrate its capacity for stable and progressive government, to fulfill scrupulously its established duties to other nations, to settle its international differences and disputes by none but peaceful methods, and to make its full contribution to the maintenance of enduring peace.

IV

For decades all nations have lived in the shadow of threatened coercion or war. This has imposed heavy burdens of armament, which in the cases of many nations has absorbed so large a part of their production effort as to leave the remainder of their resources inadequate for maintaining, let alone improving, the economic, social, and cultural standards of their people. Closely related to this has been a burden less obvious but of immense weight — the inevitable limitation that fear of war imposes on productive activity. Many men, groups of men, and even nations have dared not plan, create, or increase the means of production fearing lest war come and their efforts thus be rendered vain.

No nation can make satisfactory progress while its citizens are in the grip of constant fear of external attack or interference. It is plain that some international agency must be created which can — by force, if necessary — keep the peace among nations in the future. There must be international cooperative action to set up the mechanism which can thus insure peace. This must include eventual adjustment of national armaments in such a manner that the rule of law cannot be successfully challenged and that the burden of armaments may be reduced to a minimum.

In the creation of such mechanism there would be a practical and purposeful application of sovereign powers through measures of international cooperation for purposes of safeguarding the peace. Participa-

tion by all nations in such measures would be for each its contribution toward its own future security and safety from outside attack.

Settlement of disputes by peaceful means, and indeed all processes of international cooperation, presuppose respect for law and obligations. It is plain that one of the institutions which must be established and be given vitality is an international court of justice. It is equally clear that, in the process of re-establishing international order, the United Nations must exercise surveillance over aggressor nations until such time as the latter demonstrate their willingness and ability to live at peace with other nations. How long such surveillance will need to continue must depend upon the rapidity with which the peoples of Germany, Japan, Italy, and their satellites give convincing proof that they have repudiated and abandoned the monstrous philosophy of superior race and conquest by force and have embraced loyally the basic principles of peaceful processes. During the formative period of the world organization, interruption by these aggressors must be rendered impossible.

One of the greatest of all obstacles which in the past have impeded human progress and afforded breeding grounds for dictators has been extreme nationalism. All will agree that nationalism and its spirit are essential to the healthy and normal political and economic life of a people, but when policies of nationalism — political, economic, social, and moral — are carried to such extremes as to exclude and prevent necessary policies of international cooperation, they become dangerous and deadly. Nationalism, run riot between the last war and this war, defeated all attempts to carry out indispensable measures of international economic and political action, encouraged and facilitated the rise of dictators, and drove the world straight toward the present war.

During this period narrow and short-sighted nationalism found its most virulent expression in the economic field. It prevented goods and services from flowing in volume at all adequate from nation to nation and thus severely hampered the work of production, distribution, and consumption and greatly retarded efforts for social betterment.

No nation can make satisfactory progress when it is deprived, by its own action or by the action of others, of the immeasurable benefits of international exchange of goods and services. The Atlantic Charter declares the right of all nations to "access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity." This is essential if the legitimate and growing demand for the greatest practicable measure of stable employment is to be met, accompanied by rising standards of living. If the actual and potential

losses resulting from limitations on economic activity are to be eliminated, a system must be provided by which this can be assured.

In order to accomplish this, and to establish among the nations a circle of mutual benefit, excessive trade barriers of the many different kinds must be reduced, and practices which impose injuries on others and divert trade from its natural economic course must be avoided. Equally plain is the need for making national currencies once more freely exchangeable for each other at stable rates of exchange; for a system of financial relations so devised that materials can be produced and ways may be found of moving them where there are markets created by human need; for machinery through which capital may — for the development of the world's resources and for the stabilization of economic activity — move on equitable terms from financially stronger to financially weaker countries. There may be need for some special trade arrangement and for international agreements to handle difficult surplus problems and to meet situations in special areas.

These are only some of the things that nations can attempt to do as continuous discussion and experience instruct the judgment. There are bound to be many others. But the new policies should always be guided by cautious and sound judgment lest we make new mistakes in place of old ones and create new conflicts.

Building for the future in the economic sphere thus means that each nation must give substance and reality to programs of social and economic progress by augmenting production and using the greater output for the increase of general welfare; but not permitting it to be diverted or checked by special interests, private or public. It also means that each nation must play its full part in a system of world relations designed to facilitate the production and movement of goods in response to human needs.

With peace among nations reasonably assured, with political stability established, with economic shackles removed, a vast fund of resources will be released in each nation to meet the needs of progress, to make possible for all of its citizens an advancement toward higher living standards, to invigorate the constructive forces of initiative and enterprise. The nations of the world will then be able to go forward in the manner of their own choosing in all avenues of human betterment more completely than they ever have been able to do in the past. They will do so through their own efforts and with complete self-respect. Continuous self-development of nations and individuals in a framework of effective cooperation with others is the sound and logical road to the higher standards of life which we all crave and seek.

No nation will find this easy. Neither victory nor any form of post-war settlement will of itself create a millennium. Rather we shall be offered an opportunity to eliminate vast obstacles and wastes, to make available additional means of advancing national and international standards, to create new facilities whereby the natural resources of the earth and the products of human hands and brains can be more effectively utilized for the promotion of human welfare.

To make full use of this opportunity, we must be resolved not alone to proclaim the blessings and benefits which we all alike desire for humanity but to find the mechanisms by which they may be most fully and most speedily attained and be most effectively safeguarded.

The manifold tasks that lie ahead will not be accomplished overnight. There will be need for plans, developed with careful consideration and carried forward boldly and vigorously. The vision, the resolution, and the skill with which the conditions of peace will be established and developed after the war will be as much a measure of man's capacity for freedom and progress as the fervor and determination which men show in winning the victory.

Without impediment to the fullest prosecution of the war — indeed for its most effective prosecution — the United Nations should from time to time, as they did in adopting the Atlantic Charter, formulate and proclaim their common views regarding fundamental policies based on enduring spiritual values. In support of such policies an informed public opinion must be developed. This is a task of intensive study, hard thinking, broad vision, and leadership — not for governments alone, but for parents, and teachers, and clergymen, and all those, within each nation, who provide spiritual, moral, and intellectual guidance. Never did so great and so compelling a duty in this respect devolve upon those who are in positions of responsibility, public and private.

.
D. S. Bul, VII, p. 639-46, *D. S. Publication*, 1773.

John G. Winant, Ambassador to the United Kingdom: Speech to the Royal Empire Society, London, July 28, 1942

. . . It has seemed to me for some time that there has been presented to both of us an opportunity to join together in a common effort to develop a policy that would give greater security to the peoples who live in the Atlantic islands off the coasts of the Americas, under our separate jurisdiction, but now in several instances with a degree of joint responsibility because of our Base Lease Agreements, and yet without interference with sovereign rights.

The war has brought some benefits but also much hardship to these areas in which we both hold a deep responsibility. Neither in land area nor in population is this task of great magnitude, but it presents to an unusual degree the social, racial, and economic problems that are part of responsible colonial government. These problems can only be solved by the joint effort of both Governments, because transport and the economy of the war effort are involved, and yet I believe that much could be done within the area to increase their war contribution, to do justice to those involved, and to compel recognition of honest trusteeship both here and at home. . . .

The Times, July 29, 1942, p. 2.

***Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message to Prime Minister Churchill
Commemorating the First Anniversary of the Atlantic Charter, August 14, 1942***

A year ago today you and I, as representatives of two free nations, set down and subscribed to a declaration of principles common to our peoples. We based, and continue to base, our hopes for a better future for the world on the realization of these principles. This declaration is known as the Atlantic Charter.

A year ago today the nations resisting a common barbaric foe were units or small groups, fighting for their existence.

Now, these nations and groups of nations in all the continents of the earth have united. They have formed a great union of humanity, dedicated to the realization of that common program of purposes and principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter, through world-wide victory over their common enemies. Their faith in life, liberty, independence and religious freedom, and in the preservation of human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, has been given form and substance and power through a great gathering of peoples now known as the United Nations.

Freedom and independence are today in jeopardy — the world over. If the forces of conquest are not successfully resisted and defeated there will be no freedom and no independence and no opportunity for freedom for any nation.

It is, therefore, to the single and supreme objective of defeating the Axis forces of aggression that the United Nations have pledged all their resources and efforts.

When victory comes, we shall stand shoulder to shoulder in seeking to nourish the great ideals for which we fight. It is a worthwhile battle

It will be so recognized through all the ages, even amid the unfortunate peoples who follow false gods today.

We reaffirm our principles. They will bring us to a happier world

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 697.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Statement Regarding Crimes against Civilian Populations in Occupied Countries, Washington, August 21, 1942

The Secretary of State recently forwarded to me a communication signed by the Ambassador of the Netherlands and the Ministers of Yugoslavia and Luxemburg on behalf of the Governments of Belgium, Greece, Luxemburg, Norway, Netherlands, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the French National Committee in London, calling attention to the barbaric crimes against civilian populations which are being committed in occupied countries, particularly on the continent of Europe.

In this communication, attention was invited to the declaration¹ signed in London on January 13, 1942 by the representatives of nine governments whose countries are under German occupation. This declaration affirmed that acts of violence thus perpetrated against the civilian populations are at variance with accepted ideas concerning acts of war and political offenses as these are understood by civilized nations; stated that the punishment, through the channel of organized justice of those guilty and responsible for these crimes, is one of the principal war aims of the contracting governments; and recorded the determination of the contracting governments in a spirit of international solidarity to see to it that those guilty and responsible, whatever their nationality, are handed over to justice and tried and that the sentences pronounced are carried out.

The communication which I have just received from the chiefs of mission of the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, and Luxemburg states that these acts of oppression and terror have taken proportions and forms giving rise to the fear that as the defeat of the enemy countries approaches, the barbaric and unrelenting character of the occupational regime will become more marked and may even lead to the extermination of certain populations.

As I stated on October 25, 1941:

[Here follows quotation, see text, p 53.]

¹ See section United Nations, p. 7.

The Government of the United States has been aware for some time of these crimes. Our Government is constantly receiving additional information from dependable sources, and it welcomes reports from any trustworthy source which would assist in keeping our growing fund of information and evidence up to date and reliable.

The United Nations are going to win this war. When victory has been achieved, it is the purpose of the Government of the United States, as I know it is the purpose of each of the United Nations, to make appropriate use of the information and evidence in respect to these barbaric crimes of the invaders, in Europe and in Asia. It seems only fair that they should have this warning that the time will come when they shall have to stand in courts of law in the very countries which they are now oppressing and answer for their acts.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 709.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Address to the International Student Assembly, Washington, September 3, 1942

. . . the cause of the United Nations is the cause of youth itself. It is the hope of the new generation and the generations that are to come — hope for a new life that can be lived in freedom and justice and decency.

This fact is becoming clearer every day to the young people of Europe, where the Nazis are trying to create youth organizations built on the Nazi pattern. It is not a pattern devised by youth for youth. It is a pattern devised by Hitler and imposed upon youth by a form of mental forcible feeding — a diet of false facts, distortions, and prohibitions — all backed up by the guns of the Gestapo.

We exult in the thought that it is the young, free men and women of the United Nations and not the wound-up robots of the slave states who will mold the shape of the new world.

The delegates to this International Student Assembly represent the 29 United Nations. They also represent, in spirit at least, the younger generation of many other nations who, though they are not now actively at war on our side, are with us heart and soul in aspiration for a secure and peaceful world.

Before the first World War very few people in any country believed that youth had the right to speak for itself as a group or to participate in councils of state.

We have learned much since then. We know that wisdom does not come necessarily with years, that old men may be foolish and young

men may be wise But in every war it is the younger generation which bears the burden of combat and inherits all the ills that war leaves in its wake.

In the economic crises that followed the false prosperity after the first World War, many young men and women suffered even more than did their elders. For they were denied the primary opportunities for education, for training, for work, or even for food enough to build up healthy bodies. As a result, they were tempted to seek some simple remedy not only for their own individual problems but for all the problems that beset the world. Some listened to alien, siren voices which offered glib answers to all the questions. "Democracy is dead," said these voices. "Follow us, and we will teach you efficiency. We will give you power over inferior races. And all that we ask you to give in return is your freedom."

Other young people in the democracies listened to gospels of despair. They took refuge in cynicism and bitterness.

However, the day finally came when all theory had to give way to fact — the terrible, tangible fact of dive bombers, panzer divisions, the actual threat to the security of every home and every family in every free country in the world. And when that fact became clear to our youth they answered the call to arms — many millions of them; and today they are determined to fight until the forces of aggression have been utterly destroyed.

.

You young Americans today are conducting yourselves in a manner that is worthy of the highest, proudest traditions of our Nation.

.

. . . you know why you are fighting. You know that the road which has led you to the Solomon Islands or to the Red Sea or to the coast of France is in fact an extension of Main Street, and that when you fight, anywhere along that road, you are fighting in the defense of your own homes, your own free schools, your own churches, your own ideals.

We here at home are supremely conscious of our obligations to you, now and in the future. We will not let you down.

We know that in the minds of many of you are thoughts of interrupted education, interrupted careers, delayed opportunities for getting a job. The solution of such problems cannot be left, as it was last time, to mere chance This Government has accepted the responsibility for seeing to it that, wherever possible, work has been provided for those

who were willing and able but who could not find work. That responsibility will continue after the war. And when you come home we do not propose to involve you, as last time, in a domestic economic mess of our own making.

You are doing first things first — fighting to win this war. For you know that should this war be lost all our plans for the peace to follow would be meaningless.

Victory is essential; but victory is not enough for you — or for us. We must be sure that when you have won victory you will not have to tell your children that you fought in vain — that you were betrayed. We must be sure that in your homes there will not be want, that in your schools only the living truth will be taught, that in your churches there may be preached without fear a faith in which men may deeply believe.

The better world for which you fight — and for which some of you give your lives — will not come merely because we shall have won the war. It will not come merely because we wish very hard that it would come. It will be made possible only by bold vision, intelligent planning, and hard work. It cannot be brought about overnight but only by years of effort and perseverance and unfaltering faith.

You young soldiers and sailors, farmers and factory workers, artists and scholars, who are fighting our way to victory now, all of you will have to take your part in shaping that world. You will earn it by what you do now; but you will not attain it if you leave the job for others to do alone. When you lay aside your gun at the end of the war, you cannot at the same time lay aside your duty to the future.

What I have said to our American soldiers and sailors applies to all the young men and women of the United Nations who are facing our common enemies. There is a complete unanimity of spirit among all the youth of all kinds and kindreds who fight to preserve or to regain their freedom.

In Norway and Holland, Belgium and France, Czechoslovakia and Poland, Serbia and Greece there is a fighting spirit that defies the harsh oppression, the barbarous cruelty and terrorism of the Nazis. . . . When the time comes for these peoples to rise, Hitler's "new order" will be destroyed by the hands of its own victims.

Today the embattled youth of Russia and China are realizing a new individual dignity, casting off the last links of the ancient chains of imperial despotism which had bound them so long.

This is a development of historic importance. It means that the old term "Western Civilization" no longer applies. World events and the common needs of all humanity are joining the culture of Asia with the

culture of Europe and of the Americas to form for the first time a real world civilization.

In the concept of the Four Freedoms, in the basic principles of the Atlantic Charter, we have set for ourselves high goals, unlimited objectives.

.

We have profited by our past mistakes. This time we shall know how to make full use of victory. This time the achievements of our fighting forces will not be thrown away by political cynicism and timidity and incompetence.

There is still a handful of men and women in the United States and elsewhere who mock and sneer at the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter. They are few in number, but some of them have the financial power to give our enemies the false impression that they have a large following among our citizenry. They play petty politics in a world crisis. They fiddle with many sour notes while civilization burns. These puny prophets decry our determination to implement our high concepts and sound principles. And the words of these little men of little faith are quoted with gleeful approval by the press and radio of our enemies.

We are deeply aware that we cannot achieve our goals easily. We cannot attain the fullness of all our ideals overnight. We know that this is to be a long and hard and bitter fight — and that there will still be an enormous job for us to do long after the last German, Japanese, and Italian bombing planes have been shot to earth.

But we do believe that with divine guidance we can make — in this dark world of today and in the new post-war world — a steady progress toward the highest goals that men have ever imagined.

We of the United Nations have the technical means, the physical resources, and, most of all, the adventurous courage and the vision and the will that are needed to build and sustain the kind of world order which alone can justify the tremendous sacrifices now being made by our youth.

But we must keep at it; we must never relax, never falter, never fear; and we must keep at it together.

We must maintain the offensive against evil in all its forms. We must work and we must fight to insure that our children shall have and shall enjoy in peace their inalienable rights to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, freedom from fear.

Only on those bold terms can this total war result in total victory.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 729-32.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Statement in regard to United Nations Commission to Investigate War Crimes, Washington, October 7, 1942

On August 21¹ I said that this Government was constantly receiving information concerning the barbaric crimes being committed by the enemy against civilian populations in occupied countries, particularly on the continent of Europe. I said it was the purpose of this Government, as I knew it to be the purpose of the other United Nations, to see that when victory is won the perpetrators of these crimes shall answer for them before courts of law.

The commission of these crimes continues.

I now declare it to be the intention of this Government that the successful close of the war shall include provision for the surrender to the United Nations of war criminals.

With a view to establishing responsibility of the guilty individuals through the collection and assessment of all available evidence, this Government is prepared to cooperate with the British and other Governments in establishing a United Nations Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes.

The number of persons eventually found guilty will undoubtedly be extremely small compared to the total enemy populations. It is not the intention of the Government or of the Governments associated with us to resort to mass reprisals. It is our intention that just and sure punishment shall be meted out to the ringleaders responsible for the organized murder of thousands of innocent persons and the commission of atrocities which have violated every tenet of the Christian faith.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 797.

Sumner Welles, Acting Secretary of State: Address at the Twenty-ninth National Foreign Trade Convention, Boston, Mass., October 8, 1942

Point four of the Atlantic Charter promises "to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

This promise, and the balance of the Charter, the United Nations adopted as their own by their common declaration of last January 1.

How do they propose to make it real?

Some things at least are clear.

¹ See p. 109.

Access to raw materials does not mean and cannot mean that every nation, or any nation can have the source of all of them within its borders. That is not the way the world was put together. Coal and iron in combination are found in few locations. Much of the nickel of the world is in one great Canadian deposit. Neither coffee nor cork will grow in the United States. No nation can be self-sufficient by changes in its boundaries, and those who try by force to do so, as the Axis leaders have tried, bring on themselves inevitably only their own destruction. The path to plentiful supplies does not lie through physical control of the sources of supply.

The problem of raw materials is not exclusively, or even primarily, a problem of colonial or undeveloped areas. The great mineral deposits exist chiefly in countries that are already self-governing, such as the United States, the Soviet Union, Canada, Germany, Sweden, South Africa, Mexico, Brazil. Access to raw materials does not mean possession of a colony. It means effective power to buy in the world's markets.

The legal right to export raw materials has seldom been restricted by producing countries. True, the United States and other countries sometimes have been guilty of forbidding the export of certain things needed for production elsewhere, for fear that others might obtain the means to trespass on their markets. But those cases were rare. Countries producing raw materials desired normally to sell their surplus, and the problem usually was to find a profitable market. The right to buy was real and satisfied peace-loving peoples. Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, not to speak of the United States and England, bought in the years between the wars great quantities of foreign raw materials, and none of them claimed that they needed greater resources to live. The countries that complained and shrieked that they must have colonies or die have shown now by their conduct that what they wanted was not prosperity and peace but the materials for making war.

For war, indeed, one cannot count on overseas supplies, and an aggressor must first corner all he can of coal and iron and oil and copper, in the ground or out of it.

But the Atlantic Charter does not propose to aid aggression. It proposes, on the contrary, to make sure that aggression does not happen, and to that end the United Nations will create the necessary instruments — and this time they will be effective instruments and must be firmly used — to make it certain that any power that again threatens to enslave its neighbors is denied the means to do so. The materials of war must be denied to any future Hitler.

The access to raw materials of which the Charter speaks is access for the purposes of peace. For that purpose it matters little in whose territory particular resources are found. Access means the right to buy in peaceful trade, and it exists whenever that right is effective and secure.

What forces then have interfered with that right in the past or may interfere with it in the future?

Most raw materials are not subject to monopolistic practices because producers are too numerous; but there have been charges in the past, and there are charges now, that in certain cases the producers of some commodities, with the support of the governments to which they owed allegiance, have managed, by what our Sherman Law calls combinations in restraint of trade, to reduce supplies and enhance prices beyond reasonable levels or to discriminate among their customers. A world devoted to increased production and fair and fruitful exchange of all kinds of useful goods cannot tolerate such practices.

But monopoly in the field of raw materials is not the major problem. Most materials are plentiful in peace, and their producers want to sell them to any customer who has the means to buy. The real problem of consumers has always been the means of payment. In the world that emerges from the war that problem will be very serious indeed.

When this war ends much of the world will be impoverished beyond anything known in modern times.

Relief cannot go on forever, and the day must come as soon as possible when the devastated areas again are self-supporting. That will require enormous shipments from abroad, both of capital goods and of the raw materials of industry. For these early reconstruction shipments no immediate means of payment will be visible. That means large financing, much of it long-term. The United Nations must arrange that too. But finally comes payment, both of whatever interest burden the loans carry and for the current purchases of raw materials and other imports. I need not tell this audience that international payments, on that scale, can be made only in goods and services. There is no other way. Access to raw materials comes in the end to access to the great buying markets of the world. Those who expect to export must take the world's goods and services in payment. I hope that the United States is ready, now, to act upon that lesson.

The United Nations have agreed to act upon it, and in mutual-aid agreements with a growing number of them we and they have promised to direct our common efforts to increased production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of all kinds of useful goods. We and they have promised further to attack the problem by removing dis-

criminations in the treatment of international trade and by reducing unwarranted and artificial tariff barriers. The future prosperity and peace of the world, and of the United States, depend vitally on the good faith and the thoroughness with which we and they together carry out those promises.

During the war as fully as we can, and more fully after we have destroyed the madmen who seek to rule the world by force and terror, we of the United Nations will go forward in a loyal partnership to carry out the pledges we have made to each other and the world.

There is no limit, then, to the material prosperity which is within the reach of the United States, and of mankind. The great thing that has happened in our time is that mankind at long last has taught itself enough of the means and techniques of production, of transport, and of scientific agriculture so that it is technically possible to produce and to distribute on this planet the basic physical necessities of health and decent living for all of the world's people. What remains — and it is a great and formidable task — is so to remake our relations with each other, in loyal and cooperative effort, that the great productive forces which are within our sight may function freely for the benefit of all. It is within our power to make a mighty start upon that road; we have laid down the principles of action; it is for the people of the United States to determine whether their Government is to be authorized to carry on.

For 12 tragic years after the close of the last World War the United States withdrew from almost every form of constructive cooperation with the other nations of the earth

We are reaping the bitter cost of that isolation.

For I am persuaded that, after the victory is won, so long as the power and influence of the United States are felt in the councils of the world, so long as our cooperation is effectively offered, so long can one hope that peace can and will be maintained.

.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 808-13.

John G. Winant, Ambassador to the United Kingdom: Address at the University of Leeds, October 9, 1942

.

. . . If we neglect the moral basis of our life, we invite a revolution against the very conception of moral law. The world-wide war which has been created by the Axis is in fact such a revolution. It is not a war

in the limited sense of a struggle for land or a struggle for trade advantage. It is a revolt against the concept of civilization by people who boast they believe in nothing but force, and who therefore can no more build a new order than a gangster who has murdered all the policemen can build a city government

This is an optimistic reading of history, because it suggests what we must do to avoid another outburst of Axis-trouble a generation hence. It makes clear that it is our duty to win the war: but it also reminds us in what way it is our duty to make the war worth winning

Virtue cannot be conquered upon the field of battle. All that can be won on that field is the chance to make a world fit for man to inhabit. We won that chance in 1918, and failed to take advantage of it. It is not usual in this stern world to be offered, as we are now offered, a second chance.

.

A worse evil or a better good: that is the meaning of modern history. That is the only choice offered to us in this hour of decision. For the time being we are no longer permitted to be mediocre. For the time being we must be unusually good, or catastrophically bad.

I do not mean that man can live permanently in such a state of tension. I do mean that ours is an apocalyptic time, and that, as Professor Perry says, we must be "unprecedentedly base" or else we must have "the courage of our humane, Christian, liberal and democratic convictions."

The creed we have long professed, in all the free countries of the Western world, is a daring creed, difficult to make real, a creed which demands devoted service if it is to be anything more than Sunday piety. The ultimate challenge has been issued by the forces of history. We in our generation must rise to greatness, or we must resign ourselves to the forces of evil. We must attend to the "unfinished business which was long ago included in our agenda" or we must permit the barbarian to return again, as he has so often done before, to liquidate a civilization which has lost confidence in itself.

We may beat our Axis enemies on every continent and every ocean, yet the world revolt against civilization will begin again unless we destroy the roots of cynicism by proving in conduct that we believe the words for which our world is supposed to stand: such words as justice, freedom, Christian brotherhood.

It is worth noting that if this analysis is correct we do not want a new tradition, we do not want revolution, we want only to preserve, and to make real in a world of action, the great traditions we have inherited,

and which we will yet realize in free government and the Christian faith.

In the economic sphere, for example, we do not want a new economic system: we want to learn to use the many systems we already possess so as best to serve our purposes. In Great Britain, today, as in the United States, there are at least half a dozen economic systems working side by side. At the one extreme we have complete individual private ownership with little restriction over the use of the property by the owner. At the other extreme we have complete state ownership. Between these extremes we have many types of private ownership under varying forms of government restrictions: we have many types of cooperative ownership and control: we have a bewildering variety of forms of corporate ownership.

The only sensible question to ask of these economic methods is whether in their various fields they best serve the ends of our society. We should not say of any of them: this is good because it is a form of capitalism, or bad because it is a form of socialism. We should say: this is good or bad because in its own sphere it promotes or fails to promote the justice and equality of opportunity and freedom which are the purpose of our society.

But we cannot make such judgments unless we keep steadily in mind that these things *are* the purpose of our society: that any economic device is good to the extent that it serves them, bad to the extent that it thwarts them. We must, in other words, be absolute about our principal ends, relative and pragmatic about the mechanical means used to serve those ends.

We are fighting to win a second chance to make the greatest of traditions come true. Do not let us ever talk as if we were fighting to substitute something else for that tradition, because there is nothing to substitute. Either we go ahead perfecting the political and moral system we have inherited, or we let the system perish and the world revert to the barbarian. That is the meaning of the challenge of Hitlerism. There is no middle course: we can no longer half-serve and half-neglect our way of life.

Whatever one of our institutions we study we find the same need — the need to perfect it in the name of our historic purposes, but never the need to throw it away in the name of revolution. The institution of nationalism is a good example. It is true that nationalism needs to be purified if we are to save our life. It is not true that nationalism needs to be abolished. It has proved its deep strength under the fire of war. It is nationalism, and the patriotism it engenders, which has made it

possible for nation after nation to resist the revolution of barbarism. Let us not talk as if, the minute war is over, we can take nationalism out of our hearts. But let us not talk either, as if it must always be as imperfect, as conflict-breeding, as it has been in the past. We also believe we can build beyond nationalism an orderly international world.

"The web of history," said Lord Acton, "is woven without a void." All that we can hope to do tomorrow depends upon what we and our forebears have done in the past. If we break the continuity, if we cut the web of history, we hand the world to chaos and the dark ages. The lesson of today's disasters is not discouragement with our way of life, not a clamor for something totally new — which is impossible. The lesson is that the time has come when we must serve our great tradition greatly, because nothing less will serve us.

Copy received from the Department of State, Washington.

*Department of State: Press Release on Extraterritoriality in China,¹
Washington, October 9, 1942*

The President of the United States in the year 1934 and the Department of State on various occasions since, and as announced on July 19, 1940 and on May 31, 1941, expressed the willingness of this Government, when conditions should be favorable therefor, to negotiate with the Chinese Government for the relinquishment of the extraterritorial and related rights and privileges hitherto possessed by the United States in China.

On October 9, 1942 the Acting Secretary of State informed the Chinese Ambassador in Washington that the Government of the United States is prepared promptly to negotiate with the Chinese Government a treaty providing for the immediate relinquishment of this country's extraterritorial rights in China and for the settlement of related questions and that the Government of the United States expects in the near future to present to the Chinese Government for its consideration a draft treaty which would accomplish the purpose mentioned.

¹ The press release was accompanied by the following "Note to the Press":

"For reference to other steps taken by this Government and to developments in the Far East, since 1931, having a bearing upon the subject-matter of this statement, see the Department's press release no. 351, July 19, 1940 (which appeared in the *Bulletin* of July 20, 1940, page 36), and no. 268, May 31, 1941 (which appeared in the *Bulletin* of May 31, 1941, page 661)." [Here follows the text of press releases mentioned.]

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek replied by telegram on October 13 (*D. S. Bul.*, VII, p. 839) and the Secretary of State on October 24 handed the draft treaty to the Chinese Ambassador (*ibid.*, p. 854). The treaty and accompanying exchange of notes were signed on January 11, 1943 (*ibid.*, VIII, p. 59).

The Government of the United States has during the past several weeks exchanged views with the British Government in regard to this general question, and the Government of the United States is gratified to know that the British Government shares this Government's views and is taking similar action.¹

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 805-8.

Joseph C. Grew, Former American Ambassador to Japan: Address for United China Relief, Carnegie Hall, New York, October 10, 1942

.

The Pacific and the Far East, when we have cleared them of the scourge of war, will justify the effort and the sacrifices involved in that achievement. We and the nations in that area that are resisting militarism and aggression are fighting not only for freedom but for world peace, world democracy, and world prosperity. Beyond the general aims of our war for survival there are positive high objectives in the Pacific and Far East to which we can and shall attain.

First, once Japan is destroyed as an aggressive force, we know of no other challenging power that can appear in the Pacific. The nations now members of the Pacific Council in Washington are quite simply fighting primarily for freedom — to live their own national and individual lives and to let live. No one of these powers has serious strategic claims or designs upon the independence or territory of another. There are no frontiers stained with centuries of bloodshed of international war. The Pacific nations have clear disposition to cooperate. Once militant Japan is out of the picture, there should remain no threat of further war in the Pacific area. I say this advisedly. Japan is the one enemy, and the only enemy, of the peaceful peoples whose shores overlook the Pacific Ocean.

Second, the winning of the war will bring its own rewards in uniting the Pacific peoples. Friendships and opportunities for mutual education and enrichment, both material and spiritual, possess limitless possibilities for good. The share of the Chinese in the new Pacific is bound to be a great one. Our collaboration with China will be made the easier by the sympathy which United China relief and its related organizations have shown the Chinese people.

Third, we can hold out hope of a liberated Japan. A population as great as that of the German Reich waits to be freed not only from its

¹ The Chinese Government and the British Government signed a treaty on extra-territoriality at Chungking on January 11, 1943 (*D. S. Bul.*, VIII, p. 59).

militarist masters but from itself. The Japanese have great cultural assets which they could continue to contribute to the happiness and civilization of mankind. But they have — particularly in recent years — been led along a road of militarism and overweening extremist ambition which have directed Japanese civilization into a blind alley of potential ruin. We and our allies of the United Nations can free those people of Japan who yearn in secret merely to be allowed to pursue their normal beauty-loving lives, in peace, in their own homes, and in their own cultural surroundings. But we must realize that the captivity in which they are held is no mere temporary phenomenon of an occupying force or of a police control suddenly grown tyrannical: it is the despotism of tradition through the centuries, grown corrupt, savage, and untrue even to its own followers. Whatever desire some of the more enlightened elder statesmen of Japan may have had for peace, they have in recent times been completely overridden by the utterly ruthless extremist elements in the country. Even during the period of our internment in Tokyo the scorn in which they held the Foreign Office was only too evident, and whatever effort was made by the latter to bring our treatment into accord with international usage was in many cases arbitrarily overruled by the military and metropolitan police who dealt with us in the Embassy not merely as prisoners but as though we were criminal prisoners.

In this, again, the role of China is of fundamental import — by reason of China's propinquity to Japan, by reason of China's cultural leadership of the Far East. For almost three thousand years Chinese civilization has been the stabilizer and illuminator of Far Eastern life.

In the Pacific war we are, therefore, not only fighting for progress, for democracy, for the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter. We are fighting to free the richest cultural heritage of East Asia, and in this fight we are proud of our indispensable ally, China, and of her leader, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

.

Let me finally say to you this: The war will be well fought and well won if we fight for the world to come and not merely against the enemies who threaten us. A crusade for righteousness and freedom is stronger than the strongest defense. With China and the other United Nations, as we fight the war, we shall build the future.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 797-800.

*Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State: Address on "The Realist Base of American Foreign Policy" before the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, Birmingham, October 15, 1942*¹

.

Modern war is a continuous process. It involves organizing and maintaining a continuous belt line from the farms and the munitions factories to the fighting fronts. All of this huge belt line has to work all the time, and work in gear. If any part of it breaks down, all the fighting fronts are endangered.

For that reason, the United Nations have already forged a huge international economic system. That system exists now, and is working. This war runs through all the continents, and includes fronts in the Arctic Aleutians and the African tropics. It ranges from the Solomon Islands to the Russian steppes, and is fought in the Egyptian desert and in the Channel ports. When supply has to flow to all these fronts, you can see that the economics of war are international by their very nature.

It has been necessary to organize production on an international basis so that supplies, civilian and military, may be planned ahead, may be created for tomorrow, and may be gathered for today. No one country could possibly achieve this. There are, accordingly, combined boards which plan the utilization of the raw materials resources of the United Nations; such a board is working in Washington now, and a counterpart exists in London.

Raw materials are useful only as they produce supplies and munitions. Last June there was created a combined Production and Resources Board, which shall "take account of the need for maximum utilization of the productive resources available to the United States, the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United Nations."

There is a Combined Food Board to work in collaboration toward the best utilization of food resources and to formulate plans for the development, expansion, and purchase of necessary food.

Since supplies must reach the place where they are needed, there is a Combined Shipping Board, which, in essence, pools the shipping of the Allied maritime powers.

When it comes to arms, the language of the agreement is worth repeating: "The entire munitions resources of Great Britain and the United States will be deemed to be in a common pool." Out of this

¹ See also speech of Vernon E. Bundy, Division of Commercial Policy, October 31, 1942 (*D. S. Bul.*, VII, p. 879-85).

pool, all the United Nations must draw their war supplies, save Russia, who has supplies of her own, but needs all reenforcement from the pool that ships can carry and ports receive. The Munitions Assignment Board has the huge task of allocating the weapons of war to the fighting fronts.

Were it not for this vast machinery, the war would probably have been over long ago. Were it not that this machinery is truly international, the free fighting nations would have been weakened one by one to the point of defeat, and hammered into submission for lack of munitions, or starved into impotence for lack of supply.

This is the "commerce" of war time: a commerce such as the world has never seen. This commerce matches armor against danger; maintains distribution and supply behind the lines. This commerce says, in a word, that the combined resources of all the free nations shall be devoted to the common defense, and shall be laid on the line when and where they are needed.

During the period of war, this is the machinery that must support the economic life of all the United Nations, including ourselves. Sometimes we have been criticized because the huge machine did not get into action more rapidly. Much of this criticism is sound and useful. But it must be remembered that all this huge design of war-time life has been built within a period of nine months. It will increase in effectiveness until the war is over.

When victory comes — as come it will — this vast machinery will be the way by which the civilian population of most of the world gets its supplies. The organization will be there, and standing; it will have under its direct charge the resources of most of the world.

I ask you to remember this, because we shall have the problem, when peace is won, of keeping and holding that peace through an extremely difficult period. You cannot expect order in a hungry world — and the world will be very hungry indeed. The machinery which has been built up to supply us during war-time will have to be used, in large measure, to keep us supplied until the commerce of peace can be re-established. There will be no other way. Until new arrangements can be made to reopen the flow of trade and commerce, to start production out, to repair the wrecked plants, and replace the broken machines, we shall have to rely for a time on the war supplies, while we are working to re-establish the business of peace.

The technique of that period of transition must be planned and thought out soon — for this time we cannot risk the breaking of all ranks which took place in 1918 when Germany collapsed. Then the

Allied machinery stopped at once; Europe, and, to some extent, America, were shaken in the convulsion of a great economic crisis. In the ensuing confusion, the victory of World War I was literally frittered away.

In that transition period, it will be necessary by a combined effort to make arrangements, — and make them quickly — so that nations generally can use their resources and their manpower to satisfy their peoples' needs.

Since no country wants to be on either the giving or receiving end of an international breadline, this means economic arrangements which permit nations to get into production as rapidly as possible and put their resources to work. They literally must increase their resources by trade and commerce — for no other peaceful way has yet been devised.

For that reason, the trade routes and markets of the world have to be reopened. The endless barriers, restrictions and hurdles by which trade has been slowly strangled in the last twenty years will have to be removed. This rule goes for everyone, — including America. No country can expect to cut itself off from general commerce without harming its neighbors a great deal and itself most of all.

To do this, however, we must squarely face one fact, and arrange to meet it. Open trade and life-giving commerce cannot exist unless you have a financial system so arranged that the goods can move; and do; and so handled that business can be done, and is.

For the transition period, at least, financial arrangements must therefore be worked out so that our neighbors in this world community can set up in business again. It will be essential for them; it will be sound commerce for us.

.

I do not see that the task is impossible. We have the resources. If it is desired to use gold as a financial base, as many people do, we have at our command by far the greatest share of the world's gold. What is more important, we have the production and the goods available to back up our finance. We shall be in a position to make and deliver almost anything which is required to give to our neighbor countries a new start in international economic life. At the very time this is most needed, we shall want to keep our plants busy, our people employed, and to provide jobs for the returning soldiers. With ordinary intelligence, we should be able to assist the general situation, to everyone's advantage.

A good many years ago, we discovered that the trade and commerce of this country could be paralyzed by a system of banking and finance

which was not sufficiently elastic. It took three panics to teach us that lesson — the panic of 1893, the panic of 1903, and the panic of 1907. In all those panics we saw trade within this country drop to nothing, though the goods were there; we saw men out of work, though the work was there to be done; we saw banks fail, though the assets were there; we saw hardship in the midst of obvious plenty. Then we finally learned our lesson and passed the Federal Reserve Act of 1914.

The existence of that Act, and the creation of the parallel agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, made it possible to end the depression of 1929 just as soon as a government was chosen which had the will and the determination to do it.

Somewhat the same problem exists in the international field. Perhaps it is not amiss to suggest that business and financial men begin to do some thinking as to how the methods which have proved successful within the United States may be applied so that the trade and commerce which is necessary for the health and for the peace of the world may be re-established and kept going.

Because of this, a good many observers, both practical bankers and students, have been advancing the idea that we could profitably extend some of the principles of reserve banking to the international field. Certainly, experience suggests that this is a logical line of development. After World War I the various financial systems of the victorious powers endeavored to go it alone, fighting each other at times, cooperating at times, in much the same way that governments made shifting alliances and had shifting antagonisms. The United States particularly endeavored to do this, the fiasco of American foreign finance is an unpleasant memory, unhappily kept alive by reams of defaulted bonds and unsuccessful international schemes. Had that same capital and energy been used with intelligence and care, and in sound cooperation with other countries, there is great reason to believe that the results would have been better for us, and that the economics of the world would have been more productive; and, most important of all, that there would have been more employment, better wages, and a higher standard of living for workers and producers.

This time we shall have to do it better. For purposes of common defense we have erected an economic machine for war supply capable of developing the entire world. In the light of this experience, it should not be too difficult to create institutions capable of handling the finance of transition and turning the processes of reconstruction into permanent processes of international trade.

Joseph C. Grew, Former American Ambassador to Japan: Address to the War Finance Conference, New York, October 19, 1942

The United Nations will not do business with Military Japan again. After the years I have spent attempting to safeguard a free American economy against the potential workings of a Japanese military economy, I am relieved to think that we shall never try again to preserve the peace and our rights by dealing with a Japan which pursues the course of a robber state. The financial system which Japan has created is one which violates all concepts of honest dealing — irrespective of the particular epoch or system. It is the mere mask for a predatory military oligarchy which neither comprehends nor approves the principles of honest exchange, of stable money, and of international good faith.

I think that you will agree that the basic issues of this war are political; that they transcend considerations of national financial or economic interest; that the economic systems of the United Nations, whatever they may be, can be reconciled — each one with each of the others — so long as they proceed on the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the subsequent pronouncements of our United Nations leaders.

The war finance of the United States, of Britain, of China, and of other United Nations differ one from another, but they differ collectively from Axis finance by an unbridgeable gulf. We have a system of free enterprise which has grown and has become modified by economic and military necessity over the years. Britain has an economy substantially little different from our own. China is committed by both theory and practice to a joint state and individualist economy, according to Sun Yat-sen's principle of popular prosperity.

These systems all are in contradiction to the philosophies of aggression nurtured by Japanese and German militarism. The Axis Powers have attacked. They think — they may not be as sure now as they were nine months ago — that they will win. We know that we will win and bring freedom — not omitting the basic, practical freedom from want — to all mankind.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 845-50.

Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy: Address on Navy Day, New York, October 27, 1942

And with victory, in God's good time, what of the Navy? The lessons of history and the facts of tomorrow will be unmistakable.

At the end of the first World War, the United States was headed directly towards world primacy in sea power. But in the following years that primacy was never attained. For years limited appropriations by Congress kept our naval strength far below the Washington treaty allowances. Only when the threat of another world conflict had begun to darken the horizon did we endeavor to catch up the ground we had lost.

Today when we are completing ships at an unprecedented speed and rapidly approaching a predominance in sea power far greater than that which appeared attainable in 1919, a question lurks in the back of our minds. Will history repeat itself? Will the United States again relinquish her heritage?

As you know, in 1919 America failed in its responsibility as the world's most powerful nation. It refused to play its part in preserving peace in the Atlantic area. A lesson so dearly bought must be well learned by our generation. And we must, when this war has been won, use our power effectively to maintain peace wherever the threat of world aggression may arise again. We cannot now foresee the methods. But it does seem likely that the use of economic and naval power would accord far more with our traditions than the employment of military forces in other continents.

With victory, the United Nations will control all the oceans and most of the seas of the world, as well as the greater part of the world's strategic materials. This control should enable us to give effective support to the efforts of European nations to preserve trans-oceanic peace. We could not, however, continue to exercise such control without continuing to maintain predominant navies.

In the Pacific the American people failed to realize in the years following 1919 the inherent tendency towards a war with Japan. We have of necessity vied with them since that time for naval mastery of the ocean which lies between us, and the lessons of history from the days of Rome and Carthage have shown that such naval rivalry must end in war. Conflict was inevitable and here also America was forced to pay a bitter price to learn the lesson we had not learned when we failed to make Guam an effective naval base and to prepare adequate defenses for the Philippines.

We paid an awful price for our negligence after the last war. We must not make the same mistake twice. Public opinion is fickle. We must go on guard. Short-range thinkers will raise a clamor again. Their arguments will have a wide reception among a people weary of war. But we must for our security insist upon the maintenance of American naval

power, at least during the transition period between the end of formal hostilities and until effective means of preventing war have been established and proven.

Press Release from the Navy Department.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Statement on the Balfour Declaration Anniversary, October 31, 1942¹

The Jews have long sought a refuge. I believe that we must have a world in which Jews, like every other race, are free to abide in peace and in honor.

We meet today when the battle for freedom is being carried on in the East and in the West and our every effort is concentrated on a successful issue. We can with confidence look forward to the victory when liberty shall lift the scourge of persecution and the might of the United Nations free mankind from the threat of oppression.

Of all the inhuman and tyrannical acts of Hitler and his Nazi lieutenants, their systematic persecution of the Jewish people — men, women, and children — is the most debased. The fate of these unhappy people must be ever before us in the efforts we are making today for the final victory; at the moment of triumph under the terms of the Atlantic Charter the United Nations will be prepared not only to redeem their hopes of a future world based upon freedom, equality, and justice but to create a world in which such a tragedy will not again occur.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 886.

Joseph C. Grew, Former American Ambassador to Japan: Extract from Report from Tokyo: A Message to the American People

. . . victory in itself is not enough. First we must utterly crush, discredit in the eyes of its own people, and render impotent for the future the Japanese military machine and all of its political ramifications. Then, and only then, can we expect to have peace and to build a new world on solid foundations. In that building we must profit by the costly mistakes and shortsightedness that rendered the peace of Versailles so ephemeral. Those errors must never be repeated.

After we have defeated the Axis states, the ghosts of totalitarianism will stalk through the world with prejudice and hate. We can exorcise these ghosts and destroy them if we do not try to meet hate with hate.

¹ A memorandum was presented to the Secretary of State in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the publication of the Balfour Declaration by the British Government on November 2, 1917, by a group of Rabbis

We must meet hate with cold but sane resolution. We must meet malice, not with malice, but with fine good sense.

Russians, Chinese, Americans, and Japanese will always look out upon the Pacific, and until Providence is pleased to transform the human race to a more complete unity, or to draw the curtain on the drama of mankind, our languages, our cultures, our states remain. Japan cannot be eliminated, no matter how extreme was the folly of their leaders. The Japanese people must achieve the freedom of civilized men and must take their role in the comity of nations.

That role will be far different from the infantile arrogance of the so-called Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. China is and always has been the largest nation, and the fount of culture, in the entire Far East; but there is room, and room to spare, for the people and the culture of Japan. Do you think that I could have fought against war for years, fought it wholeheartedly, if I did not realize that the Japanese were not merely formidable soldiers but were also a people with many sound qualities? I wanted no tradition of hatred to be established between our peoples. Indeed, I could not help see that Japanese-American friendship — however tenuous it might be — was a heritage worth preserving.

We must and shall face the problems of the peace with a broader understanding of the world we live in, knowing that to solve these problems (in the words of Salvador de Madariaga) "our eyes must be idealistic and our feet realistic. We must walk in the right direction but we must walk step by step. Our tasks are: to define what is desirable; to define what is possible at any time within the scheme of what is desirable; to carry out what is possible in the spirit of what is desirable." On these tasks our Government is working with foresight and determination today. . . .

New York: (November 1942)
Simon and Schuster, 1942, p. 86-7.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Appeal Broadcast¹ in French to the French People, Washington, November 7, 1942

(Translation)

My friends, who suffer day and night under the crushing yoke of the Nazis, I speak to you as one who was with your Army and Navy in France in 1918. I have held all my life the deepest friendship for the French people — for the entire French people. I retain and cherish the

¹ Broadcast on the day of the landing of American and British troops in North Africa, and released to the press by the White House.

friendship of hundreds of French people in France and outside of France. I know your farms, your villages, and your cities. I know your soldiers, professors and workmen. I know what a precious heritage of the French people are your homes, your culture and the principles of democracy in France. I salute again and reiterate my faith in Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. No two nations exist which are more united by historic and mutually friendly ties than the people of France and the United States.

Americans, with the assistance of the United Nations, are striving for their own safe future as well as the restoration of the ideals, the liberties, and the democracy of all those who have lived under the Tricolor.

We come among you to repulse the cruel invaders who would remove forever your rights of self-government, your rights to religious freedom, and your rights to live your own lives in peace and security.

We come among you solely to defeat and rout your enemies. Have faith in our words. We do not want to cause you any harm.

We assure you that, once the menace of Germany and Italy is removed from you, we shall quit your territory at once.

I am appealing to your realism, to your self-interest and national ideals.

Do not obstruct, I beg of you, this great purpose.

Help us where you are able, my friends, and we shall see again the glorious day when liberty and peace shall reign again on earth.

Vive la France éternelle!

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 891-2.

*Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message to Marshal Pétain, Chief of the French State, in Connection with the Military Operations in French North Africa, Washington, November 8, 1942*¹

... My clear purpose is to support and aid the French Authorities and their administrations. That is the immediate aim of these American armies.

I need not tell you that the ultimate and greater aim is the liberation of France and its Empire from the Axis yoke. In so doing we provide automatically for the security of the Americas.

I need not again affirm to you that the United States of America seeks no territories and remembers always the historic friendship and mutual aid which we have so greatly given to each other.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 904-5.

¹ For further material see *D. S. Bul.*, VII, p. 891-2 and 905-8.

Henry A. Wallace, Vice-President: Address at the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship Celebrating the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the Soviet Union, New York, November 8, 1942

Both Russia and the United States retreated into isolationism to preserve their peace. Both failed. Both have learned their lesson.

Russia and the United States have had a profound effect upon each other. Both are striving for the education, the productivity and the enduring happiness of the common man. The new democracy, the democracy of the common man, includes not only the Bill of Rights, but also economic democracy, ethnic democracy, educational democracy, and democracy in the treatment of the sexes.

The ferment in the world today is such that these various types of democracy must be woven together into a harmonious whole. Millions of Americans are now coming to see that if Pan America and the British Commonwealth are the warp of the new democracy, then the peoples of Russia and Asia may well become its woof.

Some in the United States believe that we have overemphasized what might be called political or Bill of Rights democracy. Carried to its extreme form, it leads to rugged individualism, exploitation, impractical emphasis on States' rights, and even to anarchy.

Russia, perceiving some of the abuses of excessive political democracy, has placed strong emphasis on economic democracy. This, carried to an extreme, demands that all power be centered in one man and his bureaucratic helpers.

Somewhere there is a practical balance between economic and political democracy. Russia and the United States both have been working toward this practical middle ground. In present-day Russia, for example, differences in wage income are almost but not quite as great as in the United States. The manager of a factory may be paid ten times as much as the average worker. Artists, scientists, and outstanding writers are usually paid even more than factory managers or political commissars. The chief difference between the economic organization of Russia and that of the United States is that in Russia it is almost impossible to live on income-producing property. The Russian form of State socialism is designed not to get equality of income but to place a maximum incentive on each individual to produce his utmost.

A third kind of democracy, which I call ethnic, is in my opinion vital to the new democracy, the democracy of the common man. Ethnic democracy means merely that the different races and minority groups must be given equality of economic opportunity. President Roosevelt

was guided by principles of ethnic democracy when in June of 1941 he issued an executive order prohibiting racial discrimination in the employing of workers by national defense industries. Russia has probably gone farther than any other nation in the world in practicing ethnic democracy. From the Russians we can learn much, for unfortunately the Anglo-Saxons have had an attitude toward other races which has made them exceedingly unpopular in many parts of the world. We have not sunk to the lunatic level of the Nazi myth of racial superiority, but we have sinned enough to cost us already the blood of tens of thousands of precious lives. Ethnic democracy built from the heart is perhaps the greatest need of the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

The fourth democracy, which has to do with education, is based fundamentally on belief in ethnic democracy. It is because Stalin pushed educational democracy with all the power that he could command that Russia today is able to resist Germany. The Russian people for generations have had a great hunger to learn to read and write, and when Lenin and Stalin gave them the opportunity, they changed in twenty years from a nation which was 90 per cent illiterate to a nation of which nearly 90 per cent are able to read and write. Russia has had a great admiration for the American system of technical education and public libraries. If she can continue during the next twenty years the progress made in the past twenty, she will surpass the United States. If, in the future, Russia comes wholeheartedly into the family of nations, we may expect Russian scientists to make contributions to human welfare which equal those of any nation in the world. In any event, the Russian scientists will most assuredly be doing their best to place the results of science more definitely at the service of the average man and woman. Patents based on Russian scientific work will not be held out of use to benefit international cartels.

With regard to the fifth democracy, the treatment of the sexes, most of us in the United States have felt complacent. It has taken the war experience of Russia to demonstrate the completeness of our failure. Those who have visited Russia recently say that about 40 per cent of the work in the factories is being done by women. The average woman does about as much work as the average man, and is paid as much. Thousands of Russian women are in uniform, either actively fighting or standing guard. We in the United States have not yet, in the same way as the Russians, called on the tremendous reserve power which is in our women, but before this war is over, we may be forced to give women their opportunity to demonstrate that with proper training they are equal to man in most kinds of work.

The old democracy did not serve as a guarantee of peace. The new democracy, in which the people of the United States and Russia are so deeply interested, must give us such a guarantee. This new democracy will be neither communism of the old-fashioned internationalist type nor democracy of the old-fashioned isolationist sort. Willingness to support world organization to maintain world peace by justice implemented by force is fundamental to the democracy of the common man in these days of airplanes. Fortunately, the airplanes, which make it necessary to organize the world for peace, also furnish the means of maintaining peace. When this war comes to an end, the United Nations will have such an overwhelming superiority in air power that we shall be able speedily to enforce any mandate whenever the United Nations may have arrived at a judgment based on international law.

The first article in the international law of the future is undoubtedly the United Nations' Charter. The United Nations' Charter includes the Atlantic Charter, and there is little reason why it should longer be called the "Atlantic Charter" in view of the fact that the broader instrument has been validated by thirty nations.

This United Nations' Charter has in it an international bill of rights and certain economic guaranties of international peace. These must and will be made more specific. There must be an international bank and an international Tennessee Valley Authority, include say an international Dnieperstroy dam for that matter, based on projects which are self-liquidating at low rates of interest.

In this connection, I would like to refer to a conversation with Molotov, when he was here last spring. Thinking of the unemployment and misery which might so easily follow this war, I spoke of the need for productive public works programs which would stir the imagination of all the peoples of the world, and suggested as a starter a combined highway and airway from southern South America across the United States, Canada and Alaska into Siberia and on to Europe, with feeder highways and airways from China, India and the Middle East. Molotov's first reaction was, "No one nation can do it by itself." Then he said, "You and I will live to see the day."

The new democracy by definition abhors imperialism. But by definition also, it is internationally minded and supremely interested in raising the productivity, and therefore the standard of living, of all the peoples of the world. First comes transportation and this is followed by improved agriculture, industrialization and rural electrification. The big planes and skilled pilots which will be ours when the war comes to an end will lead us into a most remarkable future as surely as day follows

night. We can make it a future of new democracy based on peace. As Molotov so clearly indicated, this brave, free world of the future cannot be created by the United States and Russia alone

Undoubtedly China will have a strong influence on the world which will come out of this war and in exerting this influence it is quite possible that the principles of Sun Yat-sen will prove to be as significant as those of any other modern statesman. The British Commonwealth, England herself, the democracies of northwest Europe, Latin America, and, in fact, all of the United Nations, have a very important role to play. But in order that the United Nations may effectively serve the world it is vital that the United States and Russia be in accord as to the fundamentals of an enduring peace based on the aspirations of the common man. I am here this afternoon to say that it is my belief that the American and Russian people can and will throw their influence on the side of building a new democracy which will be the hope of all the world.

Cong. Rec., vol. 88, p. A4252 (daily edition, November 12, 1942);
Vital Speeches, 1942, IX, p. 71-3.

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State: Address on "The Position of Italy" at the Joint Meeting of the Mazzini Society and the Italian-American Labor Council, New York, November 14, 1942

.

Plainly, there can be no compromise with the cult of Fascist slavery, nor with any of the men who have carried it on. A treaty with Fascists could be nothing more than a trap for fools. There can be no peace with those who deny the right of peace. There can be no faith in those who insist that good faith must go out of the world. There can be no compromise between free men and slave-masters. Until the Fascist domination of Italy is ended, and while Italians, however blindly, follow Fascist leadership, there can be no valid dealing save by force alone.

Nevertheless, we in America insist on hoping that the day will come when we can once more welcome into the brotherhood of civilization a free and friendly Italian nation, giving again to the world the fruit of her shining culture and her splendid traditions.

The Italy of history, of the arts, of science, of unparalleled music and poetry, the Italy which peacefully conquered in the glorious competition of thought and ideas — that Italy must be saved, for who can imagine a world without her?

The United Nations have made a pledge to Italy, as to the entire world. . . .

.

Pledge was thus given not only to the victors but also to the vanquished

No American seeks to destroy or impair the nationhood of Italy. When Italy, freed from her Fascist gangsters, is able once more to speak to the world, and as the armies of the United Nations achieve that victory which cannot fail, the pledge of the United Nations will be redeemed. This pledge does not contemplate a punitive peace: the aim is justice, not revenge.

A just peace must mean an end of danger from aggression. . . . We know that under right leadership this people can give that convincing proof. The Italian people now, while the struggle is still in progress, can give unquestioned evidence that the philosophy of conquest and force has been conclusively put aside, by joining the struggle against Nazi and Fascist tyranny.

This is little to ask. It asks of the people of Italy that they shall not condemn themselves and their children to further slaughter; that they shall accept the peaceful arrangements of peaceful peoples: that they shall submit only to those restraints which must bind on free peoples if freedom is to remain in the world. In the truest sense, the Italian nation is offered a freedom beyond the wildest Fascist dreams: freedom of religion, freedom of thought, freedom from want, and freedom from fear; the freedom of farm and vineyard; peace in the olive groves; quiet workmanship in factory and shop; freedom again to work, to hope, and to live. She is asked to accept those obligations which make these freedoms equally possible for her neighbors.

For Italy, the meaning of victory by the United Nations is this:

Final destruction of the Fascist and Nazi tyranny which has oppressed her;

Opportunity to her people to give convincing proof that she has abandoned the philosophy of superior race and of conquest by force and has loyally embraced the basic principles of peaceful processes;

Enjoyment, with all other states, of access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for economic prosperity;

Opportunity to collaborate in securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

Opportunity to work for the objectives to which the free nations of the world are pledged.

The destiny of the Italian people rests in their own hands.

.

To those true patriots who undertake the liberation of Italy, we say, You do not act alone. The armies of America and of the United Nations are close at hand, and behind them the full strength of the most powerful nations in the world. . . .

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 925-8.

Joseph C. Grew, Former American Ambassador to Japan: Address before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, November 14, 1942

.

The men now controlling Japan are ruthless, unscrupulous, and dangerous. They are not impeded by the moral scruples which are the basis of good government and of sound international relations. They give no quarter and seek none. They know what they want, and what they want is nothing less than world domination. No means are unjustified in their eyes which will take them toward that goal. They are possessed of a dangerous and fanatic belief, which we can scarcely hope to understand, that Japan's domination over all the world is not only possible but desirable and attainable.

We cannot treat with such men. We can only defeat them. There is no solution other than complete military victory — a victory to which we must devote every ounce of our energy, our strength, and our skill.

What likelihood is there, then, that when the war is won as we must win it we shall have any ground on which to meet Japan for a settlement? How may we insure ourselves against a repetition of the present tragedy?

There are many evidences in Japanese history during the past 80 years of a deep dissatisfaction with authoritarian government. Japan too has had its liberals, its radicals, its demands for popular government, its labor movements, its aspirations toward that true representative government which we believe to be essential to the progress and development of mankind.

Through the complete discrediting of its militarists, by overwhelming defeat, Japan must be purged of those elements which have made it a dangerous and untrustworthy neighbor.

Some day another American will land on Japan's shores. He too will come to a country whose government is tottering — perhaps fallen completely. He will come to a land which has tried the way of conquest and found, as other conquerors have found, that the goal was an illusion. He will find a people broken with the burdens of a desperate war — a people hungry, decimated, disillusioned. He will have a great oppor-

tunity — he and the other men of the United Nations whose task it will be to bring order out of the chaos of defeat — to take advantage of that disillusionment and to work in cooperation with those within the country who have waited and even now wait for such an opportunity. For it is a task which the United Nations cannot, dare not shirk, to see that the feudal militaristic spirit which has brought death to millions shall never again rise to do battle in an unrighteous cause. Strong in the faith that man desires the good if he can but truly know it, we — the United Nations — must carry to Japan our historical faith in the orderly process of self-government under law, in the right of the individual to live without the shadows of fear and want and ignorance, and into the clean sunlight of freedom and of truth.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 919-25.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Radio Address Commemorating the Seventh Anniversary of the Philippines Commonwealth Government, Washington, November 15, 1942

I like to think that the history of the Philippine Islands in the last forty-four years provides in a very real sense a pattern for the future of other small nations and peoples of the world. It is a pattern of what men of good-will look forward to in the future — a pattern of a global civilization which recognizes no limitations of religion, of creed or of race.

But we must remember that such a pattern is based on two important factors. The first is that there shall be a period of preparation, through the dissemination of education and the recognition and fulfillment of physical and social and economic needs. The second is that there be a period of training for ultimate independent sovereignty, through the practice of more and more self-government, beginning with local government and passing on through the various steps to complete statehood.

Even we in the United States did not arrive at full national independence until we had gone through the preliminary stages. The town meetings in the New England colonies, and the similar local organizations in other colonies, gradually led to county government and then to State government. That whole process of political training and development preceded the final formation of our permanent Federal government in 1789.

Such training for independence is essential to the stability of independence in almost every part of the world. Some peoples need more intensive training and longer years of it; others require far less training and shorter periods of time.

The recent history of the Philippines has been one of national cooperation and adjustment and development. We are sure now, if ever we doubted, that our government in the United States chose the right and the honorable course.

The pattern which was followed there is essentially a part and parcel of the philosophy and the ideals of the United Nations. The doctrine which controls the ambitions and directs the ruthlessness of our enemies — that there is one master folk destined to rule all other peoples — is a doctrine now on its way to destruction for all time to come.

The United States and the Philippines are already engaged in examining the practical economic problems of the future — when President Quezon and his government are re-established in the capital of Manila. He and I, in conference last week, have agreed to set up a joint commission of our two countries, to study the economic situation which will face the nation which is soon to be, and to work out means of preserving its stability and above all, its security.

This typifies, I think, the highest form of good faith that exists wholeheartedly between our two governments.

It does more than that. It is a realistic symbol of our grim determination and of our supreme confidence that we shall drive the Japanese army out of the Philippines — to the last man . . .

Release from the White House; *Toward New Horizons*, No. 2, p. 3 (OWI).

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State: Address before the New York Herald Tribune Forum, New York, November 17, 1942

.

The first months of confusion and of cross-currents are past. The men and women of the United States are now enabled to see for themselves the development of the strategic moves in which their Commander-in-Chief and their military and naval leaders are engaged. . . .

.

They can now fully evaluate the lack of vision and of knowledge of those who demanded the abandonment of our whole policy toward the French people, at the very moment that that policy was afforded the striking opportunity of proving its full worth — its full worth to the cause for which we fight and its full worth in preserving the soul of France during the darkest days she has ever known: France, the birthplace of so many of those principles of human liberty for which we and the people of France once more battle today.

They realize that we have in North Africa but one objective — the defeat of the Axis forces — which will bring with it the liberation of the people of France. During these first days all arrangements which we may make with Frenchmen in North Africa are solely military in character and are undertaken — properly — by the American and British military commanders. It is the hope of all of us that all Frenchmen who represent or who are part of the forces of resistance to Hitler will unite as one in the support of our military endeavor.

How can we achieve that free world, the attainment of which alone can compensate mankind for the stupendous sacrifices which human beings everywhere are now being called upon to suffer?

Our military victory will only be won, in Churchill's immortal words, by blood and tears, and toil and sweat.

It is just as clear that the free world which we must achieve can only be attained, not through the expenditure of toil and sweat alone but also through the exercise of all the wisdom which men of today have gained from the experience of the past and by the utilization not only of idealism but also of the practical knowledge of the working of human nature and of the laws of economics and of finance.

What the United Nations' blueprint imperatively requires is to be drafted in the light of experience and of common sense, and in a spirit of justice, of democracy, and of tolerance, by men who have their eyes on the stars but their feet on the ground.

In the fundamentals of international relationships there is nothing more fatally dangerous than the common American fallacy that the formulation of an aspiration is equivalent to the hard-won realization of an objective. Of this basic truth we have no more tragic proof than the Kellogg-Briand pact.

It seems to me that the first essential is the continuous and rapid perfecting of a relationship between the United Nations so that this military relationship may be further strengthened by the removal of all semblance of disunity or of suspicious rivalry, and by the clarification of the free-world goals for which we are fighting, and so that the form of international organization determined to be best suited to achieve international security will have developed to such an extent that it can fully operate as soon as the present military partnership has achieved its purpose of complete victory.

Another essential is the reaching of agreements between the United Nations before the armistice is signed upon those international adjustments, based upon the universal principles of the Atlantic Charter and

pursuant to the pledges contained in our mutual-aid agreements with many of our allies, which we believe to be desirable and necessary for the maintenance of a peaceful and prosperous world of the future.

We all envisage the tragic chaos and anarchy which will have engulfed Europe and a great part of the rest of the world by the time Hitler's brief day is done and when he and his accomplices confront their judges. The United Nations' machinery for relief and rehabilitation must be prepared to operate without a moment's delay to alleviate the suffering and misery of millions of homeless and starving human beings if civilization is to be saved from years of social and moral collapse.

"No one will go hungry or without the other means of livelihood in any territory occupied by the United Nations, if it is humanly within our powers to make the necessary supplies available to them. Weapons will also be supplied to the peoples of these territories to hasten the defeat of the Axis." This is the direction of the President to the Lend-Lease Administrator, to General Eisenhower, and to the Department of State, and it is being carried out by them to the full extent of their power and resources. The other United Nations, each to the full extent of its ability, will, I am sure, cooperate wholeheartedly in this great task.

Through prearrangement certain measures such as the disarmament of aggressor nations laid down in the Atlantic Charter must likewise be undertaken rapidly and with the utmost precision.

Surely we should not again resort to the procedures adopted in 1919 for the settlement of the future of the world. We cannot afford to permit the basic issues by which the destiny of humanity will be determined to be resolved without prior agreement, in hurried confusion, by a group of harassed statesmen, working against time, pressed from one side by the popular demand for immediate demobilization and crowded on the other by the exigencies of domestic politics.

If we are to attain our free world — the world of the four freedoms — to the extent practicable, the essential principles of international political and economic relations in that new world must be agreed upon in advance and with the full support of each one of the United Nations, so that agreements to be reached will implement those principles.

If the people of the United States now believe as a result of the experience of the past 25 years that the security of our Republic is vitally affected by the fate of the other peoples of the earth, they will recognize that the nature of the international political and economic relations which will obtain in the world, after victory has been achieved, is to us a matter of profound self-interest.

As the months pass, two extreme schools of thought will become more and more vocal. the first, stemming from the leaders of the group which preached extreme isolation, will once more proclaim that war in the rest of the world every 20 years or so is inevitable, that we can stay out if we so desire, and that any assumption by this country of any form of responsibility for what goes on in the world means our unnecessary involvement in war; the other, of which very often men of the highest idealism and sincerity are the spokesmen, will maintain that the United States must assume the burdens of the entire globe, must see to it that the standards in which we ourselves believe must immediately be adopted by all the peoples of the earth and must undertake to inculcate in all parts of the world our own policies of social and political reform whether the other peoples involved so desire or not. While under a different guise, this school of thought is in no way dissimilar in theory from the strange doctrine of incipient "bear the white man's burden" imperialism which flared in this country in the first years of this century.

The people of the United States today realize that the adoption of either one of these two philosophies would prove equally dangerous to the future well-being of our Nation.

Our free world must be founded on the four freedoms: freedom of speech and of religion — and freedom *from* want and *from* fear.

I do not believe that the two first freedoms — of speech and of religion — can ever be assured to mankind, so long as want and war are permitted to ravage the earth. Freedom of speech and of religion need only protection; they require only relief from obstruction.

Freedom from fear — the assurance of peace — and freedom from want — the assurance of individual personal security — require all the implementation which the genius of man can devise through effective forms of international cooperation.

Peace — freedom from fear — cannot be assured until the nations of the world, particularly the great powers, and that includes the United States, recognize that the threat of war anywhere throughout the globe threatens their own security — and until they are jointly willing to exercise the police powers necessary to prevent such threats from materializing into armed hostilities.

And since policemen might be tyrants if they had no political superiors, freedom from fear also demands some form of organized international political cooperation, to make the rules of international living and to change them as the years go by, and some sort of international court to adjudicate disputes. With effective institutions of that character to insure equity and justice, and the continued will to make them work,

the peoples of the world should at length be able to live out their lives in peace.

Freedom from want requires these things:

People who want to work must be able to find useful jobs, not sometimes, not in good years only, but continuously.

These jobs must be at things which they do well and which can be done well in the places where they work.

They must be able to exchange the things which they produce, on fair terms, for other things which other people, often in other places can make better than they

Efficient and continuous production and fair exchange are both necessary to the abundance which we seek, and they depend upon each other. In the past we have succeeded better with production than exchange. Production is called into existence by the prospects for exchange, prospects which have constantly been thwarted by all kinds of inequalities, imperfections, and restrictions. The problem of removing obstacles to fair exchange — the problem of distribution of goods and purchasing power — is far more difficult than the problem of production

It will take much wisdom, much cooperative effort, and much surrender of private, short-sighted, and sectional self-interest to make these things come true. But the goal is freedom from want — individual security and national prosperity — and is everlastingly worth striving for.

As mankind progresses on the path toward the goal of freedom from want and from fear, freedom of religion and of speech will more and more become a living reality.

Never before have peace and individual security been classed as freedom. Never before have they been placed alongside of religious liberty and free speech as human freedoms which should be inalienable.

Upon these four freedoms must rest the structure of the future free world.

This time there must be no compromise between justice and injustice; no yielding to expediency; no swerving from the great human rights and liberties established by the Atlantic Charter itself.

In the words of our President: "We shall win this war, and in Victory, we shall seek not vengeance, but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations."

We won't get a free world any other way.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 939-42.

Official Announcement by the White House: Governor Herbert H. Lehman's Appointment as Director of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations, Washington, November 21, 1942

. . . Governor Lehman will undertake the work of organizing American participation in the activities of the United Nations in furnishing relief and other assistance to the victims of war in areas reoccupied by the forces of the United Nations.

This is a step in the President's program of mobilizing the available resources of this country in food, clothing, medical supplies and other necessities, so that it may make an immediate and effective contribution to joint efforts of the United Nations in the field of relief and rehabilitation.

Governor Lehman's appointment assures that this country will play its part in such efforts.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 948.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Message to Nuri es Said, Prime Minister of Iraq, Washington, November 25, 1942

The American Minister at Baghdad has advised me by telegraph of the text of your letter of November 18 regarding the American-British military operations in North Africa, and I hasten to express my deep appreciation of your message and the praise you have been good enough to bestow upon the American and British commanders and upon me. I have been especially happy to receive your assurance that the Arab peoples of the Near East, as well as those of North Africa, rejoice at the success of the United Nations' arms. You may be sure that America, together with the other United Nations, will not rest until the Arab world has been relieved of every vestige of the threat of Axis aggression which has so long hung over it. In this great undertaking, which we shall prosecute with ever-increasing power, we are proud to feel that we have the sympathy and cooperation of Iraq and of all the Arab peoples.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 962.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Statement on Exchange of Notes with the Canadian Minister to the United States (McCarthy) on the Agreement regarding Post-War Economic Settlements, Washington, November 30, 1942

In indicating the objectives of such post-war settlements the agreement follows the underlying principles set forth in Article VII of the

mutual aid agreements which have been negotiated with the United Kingdom and a number of other countries. The two Governments indicate their readiness to cooperate in formulating a program of agreed action, open to participation by all other nations of like mind. Its aims will be to provide appropriate national and international measures to expand production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of liberty and welfare of all peoples; to eliminate all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce; to reduce tariffs and other trade barriers; and, generally, to attain the economic objectives of the Atlantic Charter.

.
D. S. Bul., VII, p. 977.

***Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Note to Canadian Minister (McCarthy)
Forming Part of Exchange of Notes on Post-War Economic Settlements,
Washington, November 30, 1942***

I have the honor to set forth below my understanding of the conclusions reached in conversations which have taken place from time to time during the past year between representatives of the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada with regard to post-war economic settlements.¹

Our two Governments are engaged in a cooperative undertaking, together with every other nation or people of like mind, to the end of laying the bases of a just and enduring world peace securing order under law to themselves and all nations. They have agreed to provide mutual aid both in defense and in economic matters through the Ogdensburg² and Hyde Park Agreements³ and subsequent agreements. They are in agreement that post-war settlements must be such as to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations.

To that end the Governments of the United States and of Canada are prepared to cooperate in formulating a program of agreed action, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives

¹ See section Canada, p. 311.

² See p. 29.

³ For text see *D. S. Bul.*, IV, p. 494.

set forth in the Joint Declaration made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

Our Governments have in large measure similar interests in post-war international economic policy. They undertake to enter at an early convenient date into conversations between themselves and with representatives of other United Nations with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by agreed action on the part of our two Governments and other like-minded Governments. In the conversations to be undertaken between the Governments of the United States of America and of Canada they will seek to furnish to the world concrete evidence of the ways in which two neighboring countries that have a long experience of friendly relations and a high degree of economic interdependence, and that share the conviction that such reciprocally beneficial relations must form part of a general system, may promote by agreed action their mutual interests to the benefit of themselves and other countries.

If the Government of Canada concurs in the foregoing statement of conclusions, I would suggest that the present note and your reply to that effect should be regarded as placing on record the understanding of our two Governments in this matter.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 978-9.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Statement on Albania,¹ December 10, 1942

The Government of the United States is not unmindful of the continued resistance of the Albanian people to the Italian forces of occupation. The effort of the various guerrilla bands operating against the common enemy in Albania is admired and appreciated. The Government and the people of the United States look forward to the day when effective military assistance can be given these brave men to drive the invader from their homes.

Consistent with its well-established policy not to recognize territorial conquest by force, the Government of the United States has never recognized the annexation of Albania by the Italian crown. . . .

The restoration of a free Albania is inherent in that statement of principle [The Atlantic Charter].

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 998.

¹ See also sections on United Kingdom, Greece and U.S.S.R.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President: Letter of Transmittal to the Congress of the Seventh Report on Lend-Lease Operations, December 11, 1942

We also have another task, which will grow in magnitude as our striking power grows, and as new territories are liberated from the enemy's crushing grip. That task is to supply medicines, food, clothing, and other dire needs of those peoples who have been plundered, despoiled and starved. . . .

. . . United Nations' forces will bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick. Every aid possible will be given to restore each of the liberated countries to soundness and strength, so that each may make its full contribution to United Nations' victory, and to the peace which follows

Seventh Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, p. 5-6

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State: Statement at Press Conference, Washington, December 17, 1942

I have had only one view with respect to the two central points in the international situation as they address themselves especially to the Allied nations, and that view applies universally and not to any one country or one people any more than another. The first central point is that every person in sympathy with the cause of the United Nations and every group of persons and every other one concerned should strive to unify their efforts in the support of the Allied military cause until final success. That is the supreme and the immediate question that addresses itself to each and all of us alike in every part of the world. We need all the help we can get.

With the victory won and freedom restored to those who have lost it or who are seeking it, there would then arise under point three of the Atlantic Charter the fullest opportunity for each people to select their leaders and their forms of government. These two central points of the world situation have been expressed heretofore by myself and others.

D. S. Bul., VII, p 1008.

*Henry A. Wallace, Vice President: Address on "America's Part in World Reconstruction," Washington, December 28, 1942*¹

. . . The task of our generation — the generation which President Roosevelt once said has a "rendezvous with destiny" — is so to organize human affairs that no Adolf Hitler, no power-hungry warmongers,

¹ This address was prepared by Mr. Wallace to be given on December 28, 1942, the eighty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, at the joint annual

whatever their nationality, can ever again plunge the whole world into war and bloodshed.

. . . Soon the nations of the world will have to face this question: Shall the world's affairs be so organized as to prevent a repetition of these twin disasters — the bitter woe of depression and the holocaust of war?

When we think of Woodrow Wilson, we know him not only for his effort to build a permanent peace but for the progressive leadership he gave our country in the years before that first World War. The "New Freedom" for which Wilson fought was the forerunner of the Roosevelt "New Deal" of 1933 and of the world-wide new democracy which is the goal of the United Nations in this present struggle

Wilson, like Jefferson and Lincoln before him, was interested first and always in the welfare of the common man. And so the ideals of Wilson and the fight he made for them are an inspiration to us today as we take up the torch he laid down.

Resolved as we are to fight on to final victory in this world-wide people's war, we are justified in looking ahead to the peace that will inevitably come. Indeed, it would be the height of folly not to prepare for peace, just as in the years prior to December 7, 1941, it would have been the height of folly not to prepare for war.

As territory previously overrun by the Germans and the Japs is reoccupied by the forces of the United Nations, measures of relief and rehabilitation will have to be undertaken. Later, out of the experience of those temporary measures of relief, there will emerge the possibilities and the practicalities of more permanent reconstruction.

We cannot now blueprint all the details, but we *can* begin now to think about some of the guiding principles of this world-wide new democracy we of the United Nations hope to build.

Two of these principles must be Liberty and Unity, or in other words, home rule and centralized authority, which for more than 150 years have been foundation stones of our American democracy and our American union.

meeting of the American Society for Public Administration and the American Political Science Association in Chicago. When it became necessary to postpone this meeting because of transportation difficulties, these two organizations and the American Historical Association asked Mr. Wallace to give his address by radio under the auspices of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation. The address was broadcast on the evening of December 28 over a national network.

When Woodrow Wilson proposed the League of Nations, it became apparent that these same principles of Liberty and Unity — of home rule and centralized authority — needed to be applied among the nations if a repetition of the first World War was to be prevented. Unfortunately the people of the United States were not ready: They believed in the doctrine of liberty in international affairs, but they were not willing to give up certain of their international rights and to shoulder certain international duties, even though other nations were ready to take such steps. . . .

. . . I believe the United States also has learned her lesson and that she is willing to assume a responsibility proportionate to her strength. England, Russia, China, and most of the other United Nations are perhaps even more eager than the United States to go beyond the Charter which they have signed as a declaration of principles. The United Nations, like the United States 155 years ago, are groping for a formula which will give the greatest possible liberty without producing anarchy and at the same time will not give so many rights to each member nation as to jeopardize the security of all.

Obviously the United Nations must first have machinery which can disarm and keep disarmed those parts of the world which would break the peace. Also there must be machinery for preventing economic warfare and enhancing economic peace between nations. Probably there will have to be an international court to make decisions in cases of dispute. And an international court presupposes some kind of world council, so that whatever world system evolves will have enough flexibility to meet changing circumstances as they arise.

As a practical matter, we may find that the regional principle is of considerable value in international affairs. For example, European countries, while *concerned* with the problems of Pan America, should not have to be *preoccupied* with them, and likewise Pan America, while *concerned*, should not have to be *preoccupied* with the problems of Europe. Purely regional problems ought to be left in regional hands. This would leave to any federated world organization problems involving broad principles and those practical matters which affect countries of different regions or which affect the whole world.

The aim would be to preserve the liberty, equality, security, and unity of the United Nations — liberty in a political sense, equality of opportunity in international trade, security against war and business depression due to international causes, and unity of purpose in promoting the general welfare of the world.

In other words, the aim would be the maximum of home rule that can

be maintained along with the minimum of centralized authority that must come into existence to give the necessary protection. We in the United States must remember this: If we are to expect guarantees against military or economic aggression from other nations, we must be willing to give guarantees that we will not be guilty of such aggression ourselves. We must recognize, for example, that it is perfectly justifiable for a debtor, pioneer nation to build up its infant industries behind a protective tariff, but a creditor nation can be justified in high-tariff policies only from the standpoint of making itself secure in case of war.

A special problem that will face the United Nations immediately upon the attainment of victory over either Germany or Japan will be what to do with the defeated nation. Revenge for the sake of revenge would be a sign of barbarism — but this time we must make absolutely sure that the guilty leaders are punished, that the defeated nation realizes its defeat and is not permitted to rearm. The United Nations must back up the military disarmament with psychological disarmament — supervision, or at least inspection, of the school systems of Germany and Japan to undo so far as possible the diabolical work of Hitler and the Japanese war lords in poisoning the minds of the young.

Without doubt in the building of a new and enduring peace, economic reconstruction will play an all important role. Unless there is careful planning in advance, the return of peace can in a few years bring a shock even worse than the shock of war.

.

It should be obvious to practically everyone that, without well-planned and vigorous action, a series of economic storms will follow this war. These will take the form of inflation and temporary scarcity, perhaps, followed by surpluses, crashing prices, unemployment, bankruptcy, and in some cases violent revolution. If there is lack of well-planned and vigorous action, it is quite conceivable that the human misery in certain countries after the war may be even greater than during the war.

It is true that in the long run any nation, like any individual, must follow the principle of self-help, must look to its own efforts to raise its own living standards. But it is also true that stronger nations, like our own, can provide guidance, technical advice, and in some cases capital investment to help those nations which are just starting on the path of industrialization. Our experience with the Philippines is a case in point.

The suggestions I have made with a view to promoting development and encouraging higher standards of living are necessarily fragmentary at this time. But in some quarters, either knowingly or unknowingly,

they have been grossly distorted and misrepresented. During the recent political campaign one member of Congress seeking reelection made the flat statement that I was in favor of having American farmers give away a quart of milk a day to every inhabitant of the world. In other quarters these suggestions have been referred to by such terms as "utopian," "soggy sentimentality," and the "dispensing of milk and honey." But is it "utopian" to foresee that South America, Asia, and Africa will in the future experience a development of industry and agriculture comparable to what has been the experience in the past in Europe and North America? Is it "soggy sentimentality" to hold out hope to those millions in Europe and Asia fighting for the cause of human freedom — our freedom? Is it the "dispensing of milk and honey" to picture to their minds the possible blessings of a higher standard of living when the war is over and their own productivity has increased?

Among the self-styled "realists" who are trying to scare the American people by spreading worry about "misguided idealists" giving away United States products are some whose policies caused us to give away billions of dollars of stuff in the decade of the twenties. Their high tariff prevented exchange of our surplus for goods, and so we exchanged our surplus for bonds of very doubtful value. Our surplus will be far greater than ever within a few years after this war comes to an end. We can be decently human and really hardheaded if we exchange our postwar surplus for goods, for peace, and for improving the standard of living of so-called backward peoples. We can get more for our surplus production in this way than by any high-tariff, penny-pinching, isolationist policies which hide under the cloak of 100 per cent Americanism.

Self-interest alone should be sufficient to make the United States deeply concerned with the contentment and well-being of the other peoples of the world. For, as President Roosevelt has pointed out, such contentment will be a practical guarantee of world peace and it is only when other peoples are prosperous and economically productive that we can find satisfactory export markets among them for the products of our factories and our farms.

A world family of nations cannot be really healthy unless the various nations in that family are getting along well in their own internal affairs. The first concern of each nation must be the well-being of its own people. That is as true of the United States as of any other nation.

During the war we have full employment here in the United States, and the problem is not to find jobs for the workers but to find workers for the jobs. After the war it will be vital to make sure that another period of unemployment does not come on. With this end in view, the

suggestion has been made that Congress should formally recognize the maintenance of full employment as a declared national policy, just as it now recognizes as national policies the right of farmers to parity of income with other groups and the right of workers to unemployment insurance and old-age annuities.

Full employment is vital not only to city prosperity but to farm prosperity as well. Nothing contributes more to stable farm prosperity than the maintenance of full employment in the cities and the assurance that purchasing power for both farm and factory products will always be adequate.

Maintenance of full employment and the highest possible level of national income should be the joint responsibility of private business and of government. It is reassuring to know that business groups in contact with government agencies already are assembling facts, ideas, and plans that will speed up the shift from a government-financed war program to a privately financed program of peacetime activity.

This shift must be made as secure against mischance as if it were a wartime campaign against the enemy. We cannot afford either a speculative boom or its inevitable bust. In the war we use tanks, planes, guns, and ships in great volume and of most effective design. Their equivalents in the defense against post-war economic chaos will be less spectacular but equally essential. We must keep prices in control. We must have continuity in the flow of incomes to consumers and from consumers to the industries of city and farm. We must have a national system of job placement. We must have definite plans for the conversion of key industries to peacetime work.

When the war is over, the more quickly private enterprise gets back into peacetime production and sells its goods to peacetime markets here and abroad, the more quickly will the level of government wartime expenditures be reduced. No country needs deficit spending when private enterprise, either through its own efforts or in cooperation with government, is able to maintain full employment. Let us hope that the best thought of both business and government will now be focused on this problem which lies at the heart of our American democracy and our American way of life.

The war has brought forth a new type of industrialist who gives much promise for the future. The type of business leader I have in mind has caught a new vision of opportunities in national and international projects. He is willing to cooperate with the people's government in carrying out socially desirable programs. He conducts these programs on the basis of private enterprise, and for private profit, while putting

into effect the people's standards as to wages and working conditions. We shall need the best efforts of such men as we tackle the economic problem of the peace.

This problem is well recognized by the average man on the street who sums it up in a nutshell like this: If everybody can get a job in war work now, why can't everybody have a job in peacetime production later on? He will demand an answer, and the returning soldier and sailor will demand an answer — and this will be the test of statesmanship on the home front, just as ability to cooperate with other nations for peace and improved living standards will be the test of statesmanship on the international front.

How thrilling it will be when the world can move ahead into a new day of peaceful work, developing its resources and translating them as never before into goods that can be consumed and enjoyed! But this new day will not come to pass unless the people of the United Nations give wholehearted support to an effective program of action. . . .

We should approach the problem objectively from the standpoint of finding the common meeting ground on which the people of the world can stand. This meeting ground, after all, should not be hard to find — it is the security of the plain folks against depression and against war. To unite against these two evils is not really a sacrifice, but only a common-sense facing of the facts of the world in which we live.

Now at last the nations of the world have a second chance to erect a lasting structure of peace — a structure such as that which Woodrow Wilson sought to build but which crumbled away because the world was not yet ready. Wilson himself foresaw that it was certain to be rebuilt some day. This is related by Josephus Daniels in his book, *The Life of Woodrow Wilson*, as follows:

Wilson never knew defeat, for defeat never comes to any man until he admits it. Not long before the close of his life Woodrow Wilson said to a friend: "Do not trouble about the things we have fought for. They are sure to prevail. They are only delayed." With the quaintness which gave charm to his sayings he added: "And I will make this concession to Providence — it may come in a better way than we propose."

And now we of this generation, trusting in Providence to guide our steps, go forward to meet the challenge of *our* day. For the challenge we all face is the challenge of free world democracy. In the new democracy there will be a place for everyone — the worker, the farmer, the businessman, the housewife, the doctor, the salesman, the teacher, the student, the store clerk, the taxi driver, the preacher, the engineer — all the millions who make up our modern world. This new democracy

will give us freedom such as we have never known, but only if as individuals we perform our duties with willing hearts. It will be an adventure in sharing — sharing of duties and responsibilities, and sharing of the joy that can come from the give-and-take of human contacts and fruitful daily living. Out of it, if we all do our part, there will be new opportunity and new security for the common man — that blend of Liberty and Unity which is the bright goal of millions who are bravely offering up their lives on the battle fronts of the world.

Public Administration Review, 1943, III, 1; reprinted by
Woodrow Wilson Foundation, New York City.

III. THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS

1. THE UNITED KINGDOM

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is a constitutional monarchy with executive power vested nominally in the Crown but in practice in a committee of Ministers which is dependent for existence on the support of the majority in the House of Commons. The members of the Cabinet are appointed on the recommendation of the Prime Minister who is customarily the leader of the majority party in the House of Commons. Legislative power is vested in the House of Commons with the concurrence of the House of Lords which has, however, only a suspensive veto on legislation. The present King, George VI, succeeded to the throne on December 10, 1936. The last parliamentary elections held in November 1935 resulted in a large majority in the House of Commons for the Conservative party. At the outbreak of World War II, there was a predominantly Conservative Cabinet in office under Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain. Representation in an enlarged ministry was offered to the opposition Labor and Liberal parties but declined. Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Anthony Eden were given important Cabinet posts. The United Kingdom entered the war to fulfil its pledges to Poland embodied in the mutual-aid pact with France and Poland concluded April 6, 1939 and the treaty of mutual assistance with Poland signed August 25¹. Previous to the outbreak of war, a unilateral guarantee had been given to Greece and Rumania by the United Kingdom and France on April 13². On May 12, a joint declaration on cooperation in case of war in the Mediterranean had been issued by the United Kingdom and Turkey. (A similar declaration between France and Turkey was signed June 24.)

A. The Chamberlain Government, September 1, 1939—May 9, 1940

1939

Sept 3 Declaration of state of war with Germany.³

Oct 19 Anglo-French-Turkish 15-year mutual assistance pact⁴

1940

Apr. 16 Occupation of the Faroe Islands.

B. The National Government under Prime Minister Churchill

May 10 Prime Minister Chamberlain resigned and Winston Churchill became Prime Minister with a Cabinet representing the Conservative, Labor and Liberal Parties. The Liberal National Party, the National

¹ For text see *The British War Blue Book*, Misc No 9 (1939), p 49-52; also Poland No 1 (1939), Cmd 6101

² *Parl Deb Commons*, vol 346, 13; *B I N*, 1939, XVI, p 19, 21

³ See U K, Miscellaneous No 9 (1939), Cmd 6106

⁴ *D. S Bul*, I, p 705.

1940

- Labor groups and certain individual members known as Nationals were also represented in the ministry. The only party opposing the government was a small group known as the Independent Labor Party. Numerous changes in the personnel of the ministry have taken place from time to time.
- Occupation of Iceland.
- Jun 11 Declaration of state of war with Italy.
- " 16 An Anglo-French Union offered to France but rejected.
- " 28 General de Gaulle recognized as leader of Free French group to maintain French resistance.
- Jul. 5 Diplomatic relations severed by France (Vichy Government) following the battle of Oran.
- Sept. 2 Exchange of notes in Washington providing for the leasing of British naval and air bases to the United States and the transfer of United States destroyers to Great Britain.
- Oct. 9 Prime Minister Churchill unanimously elected leader of the Conservative Party in succession to Mr. Chamberlain.

1941

- Feb. 10 Diplomatic relations with Rumania severed.
- Mar 5 Diplomatic relations with Bulgaria severed.
- " 27 Agreement with the United States for the use and operation of naval and air bases, signed in London.¹
- Apr 7 Diplomatic relations with Hungary severed
- May 31 British-Iraqi armistice signed at Baghdad.
- Jun. 8 British and Free French troops enter Syria and the Lebanon.²
- Jul 12 Mutual assistance agreement with the U.S.S.R., signed at Moscow.
- " 14 Occupation of Syria completed. Syrian Armistice Convention signed at Acre, Palestine.
- " 26 Commercial agreements with Japan denounced.
- Aug. 12 British-Soviet declaration of aid to Turkey if attacked by European power.
- " 14 The Atlantic Charter. Joint Declaration by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt.
- " 25 British and Soviet troops enter Iran.
- Sept. 9 British-Soviet armistice terms accepted by Iran.
- Dec. 7 Declaration of state of war with Hungary, Rumania and Finland.
- " 8 Declaration of state of war with Japan.
- " 13 Declaration of state of war with Bulgaria.

1942

- Jan. 25 Declaration of state of war with Thailand.
- " 29 Anglo-Soviet-Iranian Treaty.
- " 31 Anglo-Ethiopian Agreement and Military Convention.
- Feb. 23 Mutual Aid Agreement with the United States.
- Mar. 13 Agreement with Greece concerning employment of Greek armed forces.
- May 4 British and Free French troops land on Madagascar.
- " 26 Treaty of alliance with the U.S.S.R., in the war against Hitlerite Germany.³

¹ House Doc. No. 158, 77th Cong., 1st sess.

² See section Fighting France, p 563.

³ Russia No. 1 (1942), Cmd. 6368.

1942

- " 28 Agreement with Norway concerning employment of Norwegian armed forces.
- Jun. 4 Two agreements with Belgium.
- " 25 Ratification of the Treaty of Alliance with the U.S.S.R.
- Sept. 3 Exchange of notes with United States on reciprocal lend-lease aid.
- Oct. 10 Announcement that extraterritorial rights in China would be terminated.
- Nov. 8 Joint British-American declaration to the peoples of metropolitan France. Landing of British and American troops in North Africa.
- Dec. 14 Agreement with the French National Committee in London concerning Madagascar.

A. The Chamberlain Government, September 1, 1939—May 9, 1940

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, September 1, 1939

... We have no quarrel with the German people, except that they allow themselves to be governed by a Nazi Government. As long as that Government exists and pursues the methods it has so persistently followed during the last two years, there will be no peace in Europe. We shall merely pass from one crisis to another, and see one country after another attacked by methods which have now become familiar to us in their sickening technique. We are resolved that these methods must come to an end. If out of the struggle we again re-establish in the world the rules of good faith and the renunciation of force, why, then even the sacrifices that will be entailed upon us will find their fullest justification.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 351, 126-33; *British War Aims*, p. 10; *Documents concerning German-Polish Relations and the Outbreak of Hostilities between Great Britain and Germany on September 3, 1939*, London, 1939, Cmd. 6106, Misc. No. 9 (1939), p. 161, 195.

*King George VI: Broadcast Made After the British and French Declarations of War on Germany, London, September 3, 1939*¹

We have been forced into a conflict. For we are called with our allies, to meet the challenge of a principle which, if it were to prevail, would be fatal to any civilized order in the world. It is the principle which permits a State, in the selfish pursuit of power, to disregard its treaties and its solemn pledges; which sanctions the use of force, or threat of force, against the sovereignty and independence of other States.

¹ See also broadcasts by Prime Minister Chamberlain on the same day to the British Nation and to the German people. *The Outbreak of War*, Ministry of Information, London, No. 1 (1939), p. 17, 21.

Such a principle, stripped of all disguise, is surely the mere primitive doctrine that might is right; and if this principle were established throughout the world the freedom of our own country and of the whole British Commonwealth of Nations would be in danger. But far more than this — the peoples of the world would be kept in the bondage of fear, and all hopes of settled peace and of the security of justice and liberty among nations would be ended.

This is the ultimate issue which confronts us. For the sake of all that we ourselves hold dear, and of the world's order and peace, it is unthinkable that we should refuse to meet the challenge

B.I.N., 1939, XVI, p. 56-7.

Winston Churchill, M. P.: Speech to the House of Commons, September 3, 1939

. . . This is not a question of fighting for Danzig or fighting for Poland. We are fighting to save the whole world from the pestilence of Nazi tyranny and in defense of all that is most sacred to man. This is no war for domination or imperial aggrandizement or material gain; no war to shut any country out of its sunlight and means of progress. It is a war, viewed in its inherent quality, to establish, on impregnable rocks, the rights of the individual, and it is a war to establish and revive the stature of man. Perhaps it might seem a paradox that a war undertaken in the name of liberty and right should require, as a necessary part of its processes, the surrender for the time being of so many of the dearly valued liberties and rights. . . We are sure that these liberties will be in hands which will not abuse them, which will use them for no class or party interests, which will cherish and guard them, and we look forward to the day, surely and confidently we look forward to the day when our liberties and rights will be restored to us, and when we shall be able to share them with the peoples to whom such blessings are unknown.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 351, 294-6; *British War Aims*, p. 4.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for the Dominions: Broadcast, London, September 11, 1939

Let there be no mistake about this. Our determination to see this war through to the end is unshaken. We must make it clear to the Nazi leaders and if we can to the German people that this country, as the Prime Minister said,¹ has not gone to war about the fate of a far away

¹ In a broadcast on September 27, 1938, *B.I.N.*, 1938, XV, p. 30.

city in a foreign land. We have decided to fight to show that aggression does not pay, and the German people must realize that this country means to go on fighting until that goal is reached. . . .

For some of us the challenge has come a second time in our generation. There must be no second mistake. Out of the welter of suffering to be endured we must fashion a new world that is something better than a stale reflection of the old, bled white. . . .

Can we finally rid Europe of barriers of castes and creed and prejudice? Can frontiers and faiths, language and commerce serve to unite nations and not divide them? Can we create a true unity in Europe?

By Herr Hitler's own decision our new civilization must be built through a world at war. We would have wished it otherwise. But our new civilization will be built just the same, for some forces are bigger than men, and in that new civilization will be found liberty and opportunity and hope for all.

The Times, September 12, 1939, p. 8.

United Kingdom Government: Official Statement regarding Soviet Action in Eastern Poland, London, September 18, 1939

The British Government have considered the situation created by the attack upon Poland ordered by the Soviet Government. This attack made upon Great Britain's ally at a moment when she is prostrate in face of overwhelming forces brought against her by Germany cannot, in the view of His Majesty's Government, be justified by the arguments put forward by the Soviet Government.

The full implication of these events is not yet apparent, but His Majesty's Government take the opportunity of stating that nothing that has occurred can make any difference to the determination of His Majesty's Government, with the full support of the country, to fulfil their obligations to Poland and to prosecute the war with full energy until their objects have been achieved.

B.I.N., 1939, XVI, p. 1013.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, September 20, 1939

. . . The aims of His Majesty's Government have always included the formation of a stable international system, having as its object the prevention of war and the just settlement of international disputes by pacific means. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 351, 946.

*Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Statement to the House of Commons on Poland, October 3, 1939*¹

. . . The agreement between Germany and Russia² and the subsequent partition of Poland between them has, of course, changed the position in Poland, but it by no means follows that the arrangement will enure to the ultimate advantage of Germany, and still less should it affect the aims of His Majesty's Government. There is nothing in that agreement that should cause us to do anything other than what we are doing now — mobilizing all the resources and all the might of the British Empire for the effective prosecution of the war.

The reason for which this country entered the war has been frequently proclaimed. It was to put an end to the successive acts of German aggression which menaced the freedom and the very security of all the nations of Europe.

The immediate cause of the war was the deliberate invasion of Poland by Germany, the latest, but by no means the only, act of aggression planned and carried through by the German Government.

But if Poland was the direct occasion of war, it was not the fundamental cause. That cause was the overwhelming sense in this country and in France of the intolerable nature of a state of affairs in which the nations of Europe were faced with the alternative of jeopardizing their freedom or of mobilizing their forces at regular intervals to defend it.

The passage in the Russo-German declaration about the liquidation of the war is obscure, but it seems to combine a suggestion of some proposal for peace with a scarcely veiled threat as to the consequences if the proposal should be refused.

I cannot anticipate what the nature of any such proposal might be. But I can say at once that no threat would ever induce this country or France to abandon the purpose for which we have entered upon this struggle.

To attempt — as German propaganda does — to saddle us with the responsibility for continuing the war because we are not prepared to abandon the struggle before this purpose is achieved, is only another instance of German war technique. The responsibility for the war rests upon those who have conceived and carried out this policy of successive aggression, and it can neither be evaded nor excused.

And I would add one thing more. No mere assurances from the pres-

¹ See also his speeches to the House on September 20 and 26, 1939. (*Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 351, 975-83 and 1233-9.)

² *D.S. Bul.*, I, p. 172; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 334.

ent German Government could be accepted by us. For that Government have too often proved in the past that their undertakings are worthless when it suits them that they should be broken. If, therefore, proposals are made, we shall certainly examine them and we shall test them in the light of what I have just said. Nobody desires the war to continue for an unnecessary day, but the overwhelming mass of opinion in this country, and I am satisfied also in France, is determined to secure that the rule of violence shall cease, and that the word of Governments, once pledged, must henceforth be kept. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 351, 1855-61; *British War Aims*, p. 7-8.

Lord Halifax, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the House of Lords, October 4, 1939

. . . The things against which we fight are surely evil, and there can be no hope for the world, as I should think, or for the free life of the nations, until the lesson is learned that that way will not be tolerated.

If, therefore, England and France have embarked on this costly and dangerous struggle it is not because they seek material profit for themselves. War cannot bring material profit to those who wage it, whether they win or lose. Nor certainly do England or France desire either aggrandizement or vengeance. But they do seek to re-establish for themselves and for others liberty under the reign of law, the right of peoples to decide their own destinies, to trade freely, and to live without fear. Surely then, we are fighting for causes that are vital not only for ourselves, but also for all those everywhere who love liberty, and in which we can hardly fail to be supported by the sympathy and good will of many nations. . . .

. . . His Majesty's Government have always made it plain that once violence and bad faith in international relations were laid aside . . . we were ready and anxious to join hands with others, including Germany, in the work of real world reconstruction. We had repeatedly stated our willingness to make our own contribution to this end, through which benefits could be brought to the peoples of all nations alike. But it is impossible to begin to make any progress to that end unless first there is security, and unless nations can be released from the perpetual fear of attack by Germany and the consequent necessity of maintaining inflated armaments for their defense. . . .

Parl. Deb. Lords, vol. 114, 1324-30;
The Times, October 5, 1939, p. 3.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, October 12, 1939

. . . We must take it, then, that the proposals which the German Chancellor¹ puts forward for the establishment of what he calls "the certainty of European security" are to be based on recognition of his conquests and of his right to do what he pleases with the conquered.

It would be impossible for Great Britain to accept any such basis without forfeiting her honor and abandoning her claim that international disputes should be settled by discussion and not by force.

It was not, therefore, with any vindictive purpose that we embarked on war but simply in defense of freedom. It is not alone the freedom of the small nations that is at stake. there is also in jeopardy the peaceful existence of Great Britain, the Dominions, India, the rest of the British Empire, France, and, indeed, of all freedom-loving countries. Whatever may be the issue of the present struggle, and in whatever way it may be brought to a conclusion, the world will not be the same world that we have known before. Looking to the future we can see that deep changes will inevitably leave their mark on every field of men's thought and action, and if humanity is to guide aright the new forces that will be in operation, all nations will have their part to play. . . .

We seek no material advantage for ourselves; we desire nothing from the German people which should offend their self-respect. We are not aiming only at victory, but rather looking beyond it to the laying of a foundation of a better international system which will mean that war is not to be the inevitable lot of every succeeding generation . . .

The issue is, therefore, plain. Either the German Government must give convincing proof of the sincerity of their desire for peace by definite acts and by the provision of effective guarantees of their intention to fulfil their undertakings, or we must persevere in our duty to the end. It is for Germany to make her choice.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 352, 563-8;
The Times, October 13, 1939, p. 8.

Lord Lothian, Ambassador to the United States: Speech to the Pilgrims of the United States, New York, October 25, 1939

Democracy, as Thomas Mann has so brilliantly said in his great address, "The Coming Triumph of Democracy," by the law of its being inevitably gives its allegiance not to power politics but to moral ideals.

¹ Before the Reichstag, October 6, 1939.

It may not always live up to these ideals; it certainly often does not do so; but they are the stars by which it guides its life.

So immediately the democracies became actively concerned with the international problem, they proclaimed their own democratic ideas about it, and this is the idea which they proclaimed, which emerged during that period for the first time. Mankind is a community, not an anarchy of warring races and nations. War is fratricide. Nations as well as individuals have the right to life, liberty, and happiness. Backward peoples have the right to security against exploitation and to be guided towards self-government. The status of all nations, great and small, should be equal before the law. The strong and the powerful nations have no greater rights than the small and the weak. And the establishment of a true reign of law over the nations is the only remedy for war.

Those were the ideals which moved us, which underlay the war and the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, however imperfectly they may have been realized. They are, I believe, eternally true, and they were expressed with immortal eloquence by your own President Wilson.

But the democracies had not thought out what the establishment of this new world implied. They did not realize that the new world of which they dreamed was incompatible with universal national sovereignty or with many other features of the old order. That is one reason, though by no means the only reason, why the war has returned. That is why it is still in doubt whether the break-up of the old order is going to end in another plunge backward toward barbarism or a new advance to freedom.

But contrary to most people's opinion, the victorious democracies did, in the Versailles Treaty, apply their own principles to the territorial settlement of Europe. They did give to every nation in Europe the right to a separate autonomous existence. They did create security for the rights of minorities. And they did set up a mandate system to give protection to backward peoples, and none of those things had ever been done before. . . .

Fundamentally, my countrymen are fighting in this war for the preservation of some of these new values, which the democracies declared during the last war. I am not sure that our ultimate goal is yet visible, any more than we were able to see in 1914 what we came to see, largely under American inspiration, in 1918. But there are, we feel, two points which are clear. The first is that there can be no basis for a lasting peace in Europe which does not give to all the nations of Europe, including Czechoslovakia and Poland, their right to autonomous freedom and which does not clear the Gestapo out from among them.

The second is that we shall establish some security against constantly renewed wars of aggression and against the kind of situation in which Herr Hitler has been able to annex a new country by violence, by threats of violence, or by war, every six months. We feel that an armistice now would simply play into the hands of aggression. It would give him six months in which to decide where his next advance was to be made, to reorganize his preparations in the right direction, to get the democracies demobilized, so that the initiative in attack would pass back to him and he could make his next pounce before they are ready to meet it. No stable peace can be made on that basis.

I am sure there is no desire in my country to impose another dictated peace on a prostrate Germany or to take from her any lawful rights. On the contrary, I think there is a clear conviction that only through a peace negotiated with a government they can trust, can Germany and all other nations also attain that legitimate place in Europe and the world which is the only possible basis for a lasting peace.

But let there be no mistake. We feel that we today are fighting for some of the vital principles upon which a civilized world alone can rest, a world in which both the individual and the nation will be free to live their own lives in their own way, secure from sudden attack and destruction. There we stand. We can do no other. And unless I misjudge my fellow countrymen, there we shall stand until that cause is achieved

*The American Speeches of Lord Lothian, July 1939 to
December 1940, New York, 1941, p. 2-19.*

Lord Halifax, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the House of Lords in Answer to Viscount Cecil's Request for a Statement of Peace Aims, November 2, 1939

. . . the definition of war aims is not a question that concerns this Government alone, but concerns also the Governments of the Dominions and of our Allies,¹ with whom we are, of course, in perpetual contact concerning all questions affecting the prosecution of the war. The time may well come when it will be possible and right to define in greater detail the terms which would be held to be the fulfilment of the purposes for which we took up arms.

It must surely be clear that if you are engaged in a war the primary aim is to win it, and for that the first purpose we must have is, in my

¹ See also statement by Prime Minister Chamberlain in the House of Commons, October 9, 1939 and his report to the House of Commons on the accord in the Supreme War Council (*Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 352, 2 and 655-63).

judgment, to defeat those who, by their repeated violations of European order and threats to freedom, have obliged us to take up arms. We all know instinctively what we want. We want, I suppose, that every man and woman in Europe should have the chance of leading a decent and orderly life and of developing his or her personality according to opportunity. It may be that some of our broader purposes will not be capable of achievement all at once. But, I repeat, if our general purpose is clear and our direction is right, and if our people are united and resolved in defense of the principles in which they believe, then we can be reasonably confident that the outcome will be made to correspond to the convictions of those who desire to create a new and better world which may enlist the cooperation of all nations on a basis of equality, self-respect, and mutual tolerance. . . .

Parl. Deb. Lords, vol. 114, 1690-3;
The Times, November 3, 1939, p. 3.

Lord Halifax, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Broadcast, London, November 7, 1939

What is the real purpose of our struggle? That many people are seeking an answer to this question is evident from the desire expressed in so many quarters that the Allied countries should define with greater precision what are sometimes called "war aims." In general terms the answer has been plainly given.

We are fighting in defense of freedom; we are fighting for peace; we are meeting a challenge to our own security and that of others; we are defending the rights of all nations to live their own lives. We are fighting against the substitution of brute force for law as the arbiter between nations, against the violation of the sanctity of treaties and disregard for the pledged word. We have learned that there can be no opportunity for Europe to cultivate the arts of peace until Germany is brought to realize that recurrent acts of aggression will not be tolerated.

It must accordingly be our resolve not only to protect the future from the repetition of the same injuries that German aggression has inflicted on Europe in these last few years, but also so far as we can to repair the damage successively wrought by Germany upon her weaker neighbors. . . .

We are therefore fighting to maintain the rule of law and the quality of mercy in dealings between man and man and in the great society of civilized states. We foresaw indeed that the time might well come when we should have to fight for these saving graces of our earthly commonwealth.

The Times, November 8, 1939, p. 9.

Sir Edward Grigg, British Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Information: Declaration, London, November 11, 1939

What is our purpose in and after the war? . . .

The first principle, laid down by our Prime Minister, is that we seek no territorial aggrandizement for ourselves. It is time and more than time that the nations of Europe regard their civilization in Europe and elsewhere as a common charge, and we want no exclusive control of the wealth of other continents for ourselves.

The second is that we seek no dictated peace but an agreement in which all peoples, including the German people, will play their part. We seek a peace which is guaranteed by general acceptance — not a peace which is guaranteed by the strength of two or three dominant powers, while other peoples remain weak and disarmed. There must be force behind all law; but the wider the consent on which the law is based the less the danger that force will have to be used.

The third principle is that we shall strive for the economic welfare, not merely of the victorious countries, but of Europe as a whole. The greatest weakness of the Treaty of Versailles and the sister treaties was their blindness to the economic needs of the various new states which they set up. The states of Europe will, I hope, come to realize that without cooperation on a scale unknown in the past they cannot hope to be either safe or prosperous. We must strive to bring that about by making every possible contribution to the common good. It is being said by Germany and Russia that we have entered this war to maintain an imperialistic domination over Europe and other parts of the world. That is a lie. We want nothing but expanding freedom, higher standards of living, and a more abundant life for our own people and for all peoples under the sun.

The peace envisaged by our leaders and ourselves is not a Carthaginian peace in which the victors will take all they can and the vanquished will go to the wall, but a Christian peace in which all nations may help to make of Europe the closely knitted and cooperative commonwealth which great minds in Church and State have striven for many centuries past to create. . . .

The Times, November 13, 1939, p. 8

King George VI: Reply to the Peace Proposal of the Queen of the Netherlands and the King of the Belgians,¹ November 12, 1939

The immediate occasion leading to our decision to enter the war was Germany's aggression against Poland. But this aggression was only a

¹ This Appeal was made on November 7, 1939 (*B.I.N.*, 1939, XVI, p. 1284.)

fresh instance of German policy towards her neighbors. The larger purposes for which my peoples are now fighting are to secure that Europe may be redeemed, in the words of my Prime Minister in the United Kingdom, "from perpetually recurring fear of German aggression so as to enable the peoples of Europe to preserve their independence and their liberties," and to prevent for the future resort to force instead of to pacific means in settlement of international disputes. These aims have been amplified and enlarged on a number of occasions, in particular in the statements made by my Prime Minister in the United Kingdom in the House of Commons on October 12 and my Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Lords on November 2.

Peace Aims, No. 6; *The Times*, November 13, 1939.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Broadcast on "The War and Ourselves," London, November 26, 1939

What is the purpose for which we are today standing side by side with our French and Polish allies? The question has been answered over and over again by myself, by M. Daladier, by Lord Halifax, and other members of the Government. One would think that there could be no doubt about it, but there are still questioners who feel that we have not yet sufficiently defined our aims.

In my own mind I make a distinction between war aims and peace aims. Our war aim can be stated very shortly. It is to defeat our enemy, and by that I do not merely mean the defeat of the enemy's military forces. I mean the defeat of that aggressive, bullying mentality which seeks continually to dominate other peoples by force, which finds a brutal satisfaction in the persecution and torture of inoffensive citizens, and in the name of the interests of the State justifies the repudiation of its own pledged word whenever it finds it convenient . . .

When we come to peace aims we are dealing with something to be achieved in conditions we cannot at present foresee. Our definition of them can, therefore, only be in the most general terms, but there can be no harm in declaring the broad principles on which we should desire to found them.

Our desire then, when we have achieved our war aim, would be to establish a new Europe; not new in the sense of tearing up all the old frontier posts and redrawing the map according to the ideas of the victors, but a Europe with a new spirit in which the nations which inhabit it will approach their difficulties with good will and mutual tolerance. In such a Europe fear of aggression would have ceased to exist and such

adjustments of boundaries as would be necessary would be thrashed out between neighbors sitting on equal terms round a table with the help of disinterested third parties if it were so desired.

In such a Europe it would be recognized that there can be no lasting peace unless there is a full and constant flow of trade between the nations concerned, for only by increased interchange of goods and services can the standard of living be improved. In such a Europe each country would have the unfettered right to choose its own form of internal government so long as that government did not pursue an external policy injurious to its neighbors. Lastly, in such a Europe armaments would gradually be dropped as a useless expense except in so far as they were needed for the preservation of internal law and order.

It is obvious that the establishment of this Utopian Europe which I have briefly sketched out could not be the work of a few weeks or even months. It would be a continuous process stretching over many years. Indeed, it would be impossible to set a time-limit upon it, for conditions never cease to change and corresponding adjustments would be required if friction is to be avoided. Consequently, you would need some machinery capable of conducting and guiding the development of the new Europe in the right direction.

I do not think it necessary, nor, indeed, is it possible, to specify at this stage the kind of machinery which should be established for this purpose. I merely express the opinion that something of the sort would have to be provided, and I would add my hope that a Germany animated by a new spirit might be among the nations which would take part in its operations. . . .

Peace Aims, No. 7; *The Times*, November 27, 1939, p. 6,
B.I.N., 1939, XVI, p. 1314.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, November 28, 1939

. . . the peace aims which are to be achieved when the war is over cannot be laid down by this country alone, but there will be others to be consulted. There will be the Dominions and our Allies, and it may be that the vanquished will also be taken into consultation before we can decide how this new and better world is to be laid out. . . .

We have not entered this war with any vindictive purpose, and therefore, we do not intend to impose a vindictive peace. What we say is that, first of all, we must put an end to this menace under which Europe has lain for so many years. If we can really do that, confidence will be established throughout Europe, and while I am not excluding the nec-

essity for dealing with other parts of the world as well, I feel that Europe is the key to the situation, and that if Europe could be settled, the rest of the world would not prove so difficult a problem. If we can establish that confidence, then many things which have seemed difficult or impossible in the past might prove to be, if not easy, at any rate attainable.

. . . For years now it has been the generally accepted dogma, not confined to any Party in this House, that the administration of a Colonial Empire is a trust which is to be conducted primarily in the interests of the peoples concerned, and we have by international arrangements already undertaken to give free access to the markets and to the materials in many of our most important Colonies.¹ . . .

As an international instrument for preserving peace, the League has been a failure. But in other directions, in the study of economic and social questions, in international cooperation and collaboration, in matters of health and morality, and in other directions, the League has done and is doing invaluable work, the scope of which I think has not been sufficiently recognized.² . . . I would like to see that side of the League developed and extended very considerably beyond anything that has been done so far. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 355, 23-30;
The Times, November 29, 1939, p. 3.

Richard A. Butler, Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the House of Commons, November 30, 1939

. . . We are defending our own way of living, based as it is upon the dignity of the individual and upon the continuation of family life and all that that means. We are fighting to preserve the best of Christian civilization. . . . we are fighting to preserve for ourselves the liberty of conscience, liberty of religious worship, and liberty of speech and action. These prizes were won by our forefathers three centuries ago, and it is now a foreign foe who threatens them. . . .

. . . I must acknowledge that many mistakes were made in the years since the last war. . . . in future British policy should aim at reconciling our obligations with the strength with which it is in our power to carry out those obligations. I believe that if we learn that lesson we can then study any scheme for an ideal future such as federal union or any other

¹ See also speech by Malcolm Macdonald, Secretary of State for the Colonies to the House of Commons on November 30, 1939 (*Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 355, 403-411; *British War Aims*, p. 24-5).

² Refers to Mr. Bruce's report on *The Development of International Cooperation in Economic and Social Affairs* (League of Nations. General. 1939. 3.)

scheme, and try to work out what may be after the war the ideal system of international relations.

... about the detailed reconstruction of Europe ... it would be a danger, in that it is too academic, if we consider it today in the midst of war in which we are fighting for our lives. I can, therefore, define only in general terms those traditions which we hope will survive. We have in the Empire attempted to preserve those principles for which we are fighting. In his new book on the foreign policy of Britain Professor Carr refers to the British Commonwealth of Nations as one of the greatest achievements of the British democratic spirit. He says: "It has been built up out of those values which belong to the essence of democracy — toleration, give-and-take, the maximum of freedom for the individual, and consideration for the rights of minorities as well as of majorities" ...¹

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 355, 311–312.

Lord Halifax, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the House of Lords in Answer to Viscount Cecil's Request for a Statement on War Aims, December 5, 1939

... We desire peoples who have been deprived of their independence to recover their liberties. We desire to redeem the peoples of Europe from this constant fear of German aggression, and we desire to safeguard our own freedom and security. ... we do not seek aggrandizement, and we do not seek to redraw the map in our own interests, and still less — although I recognize what can be said about the increasing difficulty of maintaining this position in the hearts of our people as the war goes on — are we moved by any spirit of vengeance. On the contrary, if Germany is able to restore the confidence which she has destroyed, we aim at a settlement which will encourage her to take her rightful place in Europe, and we wish to create an international order in which all peoples, as we hope, secure under the reign of law, can determine their political and economic life free from the interference of their more powerful neighbours. To this end we would be willing to give our best, in full co-operation with other nations, including Germany, to the work of reconstruction, political and economic, for only so do we believe that the ordered international life of Europe can be preserved. . .

... What are the precise terms² upon which the country would be willing to stop the war today? His Majesty the King the other day, in

¹ Carr, E. H., *Conditions of Peace*. New York, Macmillan, 1942.

² See also his speech on December 13, 1939 in the House of Lords on the question of peace mediation (*Parl. Deb. Lords*, vol. 115, 261–5).

answering the peace proposals of the King of the Belgians and the Queen of the Netherlands, said that it was not his wish nor that of his Government for the war to continue a day longer than was necessary. On what conditions, then, would this country lay down arms? The answer to that question was given by M. Daladier in the speech he made a few days ago. He said that France — and he might have added the United Kingdom — would lay down her arms when she could treat with a Government whose signature could be trusted. She would treat when the wrongs caused to weaker nations could be righted and lasting security established. And he went on to indicate that France must have confidence that this security would endure.

A great many people write to me, . . . suggesting that an armistice should be proclaimed and a conference summoned. They say: "You will have to have a conference some time, why wait till after the war? Why not have it before you have to pay all the price that war exacts?"

. . . I suggest to you that the two prerequisites for a conference are, first, evidence that the German Government were willing to accept terms which would correspond to the purposes for which we took up arms — and everybody knows what those were — and secondly, security that any settlement reached would be respected. On any other basis a conference, in my judgment, would achieve nothing and would be only likely to enable the leaders of Germany to make their people believe that on the whole the old method of force had not worked too badly . . .

. . . We do not of course know, as yet, what will be the conditions in which peace is made. It has already been said that a new order in Europe can only come through surrender in some measure by the nations of their sovereign rights in order to clear the way for some more organic union. I do not know that I should go quite so far as my noble friend Lord Stonehaven in condemning all attempts to fashion a new order, but I do agree with him that we only court disaster if we forget that no paper plan will endure that does not freely spring from the will of the peoples that can alone give it vigor and life; and international, like our own national, institutions must be very securely and deeply anchored on reality. I often think that some, in reflecting on the future of these things, are inclined to yield to thoughts of schemes that I cannot myself believe to be immediately practicable. . . . we must build our Utopia course by course on foundations that are themselves well laid and solid.

Much emphasis has been placed, and rightly placed, upon the thought to be given to the economic side of international collaboration in the future. I would not say more today than that His Majesty's Govern-

ment fully appreciate and recognize the importance of all those issues. It may well be that, from working together to solve concrete problems and difficulties arising in finance and in trade, closer political understanding may spring and may develop. But here again, in considering the future of economic as well as of political collaboration, we must not only keep in line with our Allies and with the Dominions, but also we have to consider the views and interests of many nations themselves today non-belligerent. But if we bear these considerations in mind then we may hope, I think, to get security and then the reconstruction will, in the words of the Motion, be "wisely planned." . . .

. . . When we see as we do see wherever we look today, the rank growth of the doctrine of brute force in the world, and when we picture to ourselves how, if unchecked, this must choke all the other plants upon which the human race depends for its sustenance and its health, most of us, I think, instinctively recognize that there can be no merely temporary truce or patched-up armistice that would bring no relief. . . .

Parl. Deb. Lords, vol. 115, 122-32; *British War Aims*, p. 25-9;
The Times, December 6, 1939, p. 8.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, December 14, 1939

. . . I should like, further, to say a few words about the bearing of the Finnish conflict upon our war aims.¹ . . .

We must never forget that it was German aggression which paved the way for the Soviet attack on Poland and Finland, and that Germany, alone among the nations, is even now abetting by word and deed the Russian aggressor. We must all give what help and support we can spare to the latest victim of these destructive forces; but meanwhile it is only by concentrating on our task of resistance to German aggression, and thus attacking the evil at its root, that we can hope to save the nations of Europe from the fate which must otherwise overtake them. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 355, 1337-44; *British War Aims*, p. 31;
The Times, December 15, 1939, p. 9.

Lord Lothian, Ambassador to the United States: Speech to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, January 4, 1940

. . . The overwhelming majority of people in Britain and the British Commonwealth are now convinced that our primary task is to resist and defeat the totalitarian aggression against the liberties and values of the

¹ The Soviet-Finnish war began on November 30, 1939.

democratic world. In the light of recent experience, we do not think that we can impose democracy on nations who do not want it and who are not ready for it. But we do think it is both possible and necessary to prevent the dictatorships from extending their empire over the mind and spirit of man by force. That is why, in addition to fighting for our own security, we are fighting to restore liberty to Poland and Czechoslovakia and why we are giving all the help we can spare to Finland. And my people are equally convinced that, once that primary task is achieved, the truest safeguard of freedom and the free way of life in the future will be that the free peoples should so organize themselves that the general standard of living will be so good and so stable, the volume of unemployment so small, the freedom of the individual so secure and the guarantees against war so strong, that the totalitarian systems, if they survive, will begin to disintegrate gradually by the impact, not of our armies, but of our example. . . .

Even assuming victory, it is not easy to talk about peace with this tremendous threat hanging over us. But the general British view is clear. The kind of world of which the democracies dreamed twenty years ago was not a false dream. We think it was a right dream and that in some form it must be realized because in substance it is the only way forward for those who believe in liberty and the freedom of the human spirit. But it is now clear that in 1919 none of us understood what it was necessary to do if our hopes were to be fulfilled. The ideals which lay behind the League of Nations can only succeed if all its members are democracies. The Covenant of the League was too rigid. It had no effective machinery for making changes peacefully. The idea of universal national self-determination was incompatible with the unity recently given to the world by mechanical invention and economic progress and made both peace and prosperity impossible. The idea of federation, applied no doubt in some new way, is, in the end, the only way out of that dilemma. Yet if any form of world organization for peace is to work, the European problem must be separated from the world problem and Europe must be equipped to manage its own internal affairs, probably also by some application of the federal idea. The greatest of our mistakes at Paris were economic. What did more to wreck civilization than anything else was the belief that a war-stricken world could recover by a system which combined immense international indebtedness with unrestrained tariff protectionism. That was probably the major cause of the world depression of 1929.

We profoundly hope that the nations will think out, far more thoroughly than they did last time, how the world can be economically re-

constructed when the present war is over. Trade and production will then be in dislocation. The needs of the war will have canalized the trade not only of the belligerents but of the neutrals. Just consider how the balance of your own economy is already being upset by the war. We are being driven to cut off our orders for tobacco and fruit and other things in order to give much larger orders for armaments, machine-tools, and so on. But those new canals will serve war and not peace purposes. Yet to go back immediately peace is signed to an economic free-for-all fight will simply mean that the end of this war will produce worse results than the last. In my personal view it will be imperative for a time to maintain these controls, but to reverse their purpose, so that they are used to restore the standard of living of mankind without which the end of this war will only be the signal for fiercer revolutions and fiercer wars than the last. Once the standard of living is restored with all that means in markets for the producing nations, we should be able safely to return to a freer international economy. It is in this field that we most want your assistance and advice.

But there is one central point to which we in Britain attach supreme importance, and which I feel I ought frankly to put before you tonight. For it vitally affects the peace and is the answer to the common talk that the present is only a war between rival imperialisms. We feel that one essential foundation for a stable and liberal world will be the control of the seas on agreed principles by the democracies. This view we base upon experience, for that was the foundation of the remarkable Victorian Age. . . .

What were the foundations of this wonderful century? There were four. First, all the main currencies were based on gold and, therefore, were interchangeable on a stable basis. Second, the British Empire and a good deal of the rest of the world were free-trade or low tariff, so that capital and goods could flow freely everywhere. Third, the New World, and especially the United States, was still an open field for immigration so that the population pressures of the Old World, then at their worst because of the high birth rate, could find relief. Fourth, and most important of all, there was a rudimentary police power in the world, the control of the sea by Great Britain and the United States, which made world war — though not local war — impossible until some other nation was strong enough to challenge that power on the seas.

That police system originated in the idea that no further political expansion of Europe into North and South America should be permitted. That policy was formulated by Canning and President Monroe. Originally proposed by Canning as a joint Anglo-American doctrine, it was

eventually carried out in two parts by you and us separately. You threw your protection around South and Central America; we created the outer defense for that doctrine for our overseas possessions by controlling the entrance from Europe into the Atlantic, through the North Sea and the English Channel, past Gibraltar and round the Cape of Good Hope. So long as we had a navy which could hold these positions, no European power, except for a few casual raiders and submarines, would get into the Atlantic at all and so impose on you the responsibility for defending the Monroe system by yourselves.

Those were the four foundations of the Victorian Age. Personally, I believe that in some new form they will have to be restored, if the rest of this century is to be without another world war. . . . But the nineteenth-century system cannot now be restored in its old form. In the first place, economically the world has advanced beyond *laissez-faire*, whether in trade or migration. In the second place, Britain neither can nor ought to play by herself the dominant role she played in the last century. The rise of new naval stations and the advent of air power makes that impossible. And sea power, if it is to be used as police power, should be in the hands of democracies collectively and not of one power. Even at this moment, if we face the facts honestly, our present safety today rests upon the fact that we control the Atlantic and you control the Pacific. Neither we nor you nor the overseas republics and dominions would be anything like as secure if either of us had to shoulder the task of sea defense alone. . . .

In this war we believe we are fighting for principle; to prevent the ideas and institutions which alone can lead mankind forward to greater liberty, prosperity, and peace from being overwhelmed by brute force. We do not think that we have a monopoly of virtue; or that we have not made many and grievous mistakes in the past. But we are sure we are in the right now.

. . . We are not fighting for empire or for domination or to deprive Germany of any legitimate right. I believe we are fighting in the spirit which your great President Abraham Lincoln so nobly described in his second inaugural. "With malice towards none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right."

The American Speeches of Lord Lothian, July 1939 to December 1940, New York, 1941, p. 53-4, 58-9; *Lord Lothian Speaks to America*, New York, 1941, p. 55-65.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Speech at the Mansion House in London, January 9, 1940

. . . To put it about that the Allies desire the annihilation of the German people is a fantastic and malicious invention which can only be put forward for home consumption.

On the other hand, the German people must realize that the responsibility for the prolongation of this war and all the suffering that it may bring in the coming year is theirs — as well as that of the tyrants who stand over them. They must realize that the desire of the Allies for a social, human, just, Christian settlement cannot be satisfied by assurances which experience has proved to be worthless.

The methods that are pursued by the Government of Hitler are a standing threat to the independence of every small State in Europe. They are a constant menace to the moral standards on which the whole of Western civilization is founded.

Nowhere have they aroused greater detestation than throughout the continents of North and South America. In his recent message to the Pope the President of the United States¹ declared that only by the friendly association of the seekers of light and the seekers of peace everywhere could the forces of evil be overcome.

I profoundly agree. But I would add that if the forces of right are to prevail we must not hesitate to risk our blood and our treasure for so great an end. In our determination to achieve our purpose we are united among ourselves. We are supported by the peoples of the Empire, by the power and resolution of our great and gallant Ally, France, by the moral approval of all who realize that the fate of civilization is bound up with our success.

Against such a combination as that the powers of wickedness will fight in vain, and we, at the beginning of this New Year, can await the future with unshaken confidence in the strength of our arms and in the righteousness of our cause.

British War Aims, p 32.

Lord Halifax, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech at Leeds, January 20, 1940

We are under no illusion about the war. We know how great are the issues — the liberty and the independence of our own country and Commonwealth and of all European States.

¹ President Roosevelt's Christmas Message to the Pope, see section United States, p 20.

The instinct of our people has always throughout their history driven them to resist attempts by any one nation to make itself master of Europe; they have always seen in any such attempt a threat both to their own existence and to the general cause of liberty in Europe.

. . . if the British people have been right, as they have before, in resisting domination by any one power in Europe, they are doubly so right today.

The only reason why peace cannot be made tomorrow is that the German Government have, as yet, given no evidence whatever of their readiness to repair the damage they have wrought upon their weaker neighbors or of their capacity to convince the world that any pledge they may subscribe to is worth as much as the paper on which it may be written.

British Information Services, New York; *The Times*, January 22, 1940, p. 6.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Address to the National Defense and Public Interest Committee, London, January 31, 1940

. . . We are fighting, not only for ourselves, but for every country which is oppressed by the fear that some day they might find themselves in the position successively occupied by Czechoslovakia, by Poland, and now by Finland¹ . . .

We made an agreement² with the United States a little over a year ago which, as we thought at that time, pointed the way to better things in international trade. It was the very negation of that too prevalent system of bilateralism, of exclusive advantages, of discrimination carried to a pitch which clogs the wheels of commerce, and which promotes ill-feeling among the nations. It was based upon the principle of the most-favored-nation, the principle which, in our view, in normal times, is the best way of promoting international trade. And we mean when this war is successfully concluded to return to that ideal.

We recognize that for the full development of international trade it must flow along multilateral channels, and that we must put an end to that vicious policy of economic nationalism and autarchy which did so much to upset the last great peace settlement.

¹ *B.I.N.*, 1940, XVII, p. 165.

² Referring to the trade agreement made between Great Britain and the United States, November 17, 1938, Cmd. 6158 (Treaty Series No. 3 (1940)); *D.A.F.R.*, I, p. 337.

One of our foremost aims will be the restoration of international trade, which seems to us to present the best opportunity for restoring in turn the standard of living and the consuming power of the nations. That is a policy which we have in mind when the time comes to turn once more from war to peace. . . .

British War Aims, p. 37.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Speech at Birmingham, February 24, 1940

. . . we are fighting against German domination of the world. That is the challenge that we have taken up. But we do not desire the destruction of any people. We are fighting to secure that the small nations of Europe shall henceforth live in security, freed from the constant threat of aggression against their independence and the extermination of their people, but we do not want domination for ourselves, nor do we covet the territory of anybody else. We are fighting to right the wrongs that Germany has inflicted on people who once were free: we believe we can achieve that aim, we know it can be secured without putting other peoples in bondage.

We are fighting for the freedom of individual conscience and for the freedom of religion; we are fighting against persecution wherever it may be found. Lastly, we are fighting to abolish the spirit of militarism and the accumulation of armaments which is pauperizing Europe, and not least Germany herself. Only by the abolition of that spirit and those armaments can Europe be saved from bankruptcy and ruin.

How in concrete terms are these aims to be secured? First of all, the independence of the Poles and the Czechs must be restored. Secondly, we must have tangible evidence to satisfy us that pledges or assurances when they are given will be fulfilled. Under the present Government of Germany there can be no security for the future. . . .

. . . We and France are determined to do what we can for security by the continuance of that complete identity of purpose and policy which now unites us and which will serve after the war for the firm foundation on which the international relations between our two countries are built. Only so can we establish the authority and stability which are necessary for the security of Europe during the period of reconstruction and fresh endeavor to which we look forward after the war.¹

But France and Britain, powerful as they are, cannot and do not want

¹ See also Mr Eden's speech at Liverpool, February 29, 1940 (*British War Aims*, p. 43-4).

to settle the new Europe alone. Others must come in and help us, in particular, to bring about that disarmament which is an absolutely essential feature of any lasting peace. The problem of disarmament has hitherto baffled all attempts to solve it, because no nation is willing to abandon its own power of defense while it fears that others who have not disarmed will take advantage of its helplessness. But if we could exorcise that fear, why, then disarmament would surely follow as day follows night. And although disarmament can only be a gradual process, and will probably take many years to achieve, once we have re-established confidence among nations in each other's good faith we can at least make a beginning, and each step forward would make easier the step that would follow. In the re-establishment of that confidence among nations Germany herself can do more than any other nation, for the simple reason that she herself has done most to destroy confidence, and when she is ready to give reliable proofs of her good will she will not find others lacking in the will to help her on and to overcome the economic difficulties that are bound to accompany the transition from war to peace ¹

In the aims that I have once more recapitulated there is nothing humiliating or oppressive for anyone, and on such a basis we for our part should be ready to seek a settlement with any Government that had subscribed to those aims and given proof — proof that can be relied upon — of their sincerity. But let me conclude by repeating that the next step does not lie with us. We are resolved that freedom shall prevail, and it was because tyranny and intimidation sought to overcome freedom that we entered the war. Therefore I say, and here I speak not only for this country but for the whole Empire, that until we are satisfied that freedom is safe we shall continue to do battle with all our soul and with all our strength

British War Aims, p. 38-41; *The Times*, February 26, 1940, p. 8.

Communique issued from No. 10 Downing Street after the Sixth Meeting of the Supreme War Council, March 28, 1940

The Government of the French Republic and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland mutually undertake that during the present war they will neither negotiate nor conclude an armistice or treaty of peace except by mutual agreement

¹ See also speech by Mr. Stanley, British Secretary of State for War at Newcastle, February 3, 1940 (*The Times*, February 5, 1940, p. 8)

They undertake not to discuss peace terms before reaching complete agreement on the conditions necessary to ensure to each of them an effective and lasting guarantee of their security.

Finally, they undertake to maintain, after the conclusion of peace, a community of action in all spheres for so long as may be necessary to safeguard their security and to effect the reconstruction, with the assistance of other nations, of an international order which will ensure the liberty of peoples, respect for law, and the maintenance of peace in Europe.

British War Aims, p. 44-5.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, April 2, 1940

. . . By the solemn declaration our two Governments have now extended the scope of these arrangements to all spheres affecting the interests and security of the two nations.

[He cited the declaration of March 28, see above, p 179]

If this declaration had dealt only with the conduct of the war it might have been criticized as unnecessary in view of the complete unity of purpose already existing between the two countries. But it goes far beyond the expression of British and French determination to fight together for a common victory, and provides for continuous Anglo-French cooperation in the establishment of peace and in the reconstruction of an international order designed to ensure the liberty of peoples, respect for law and the maintenance of peace in Europe.

The House will have observed the two salient features of the declaration, namely, first, that any proposals for peace, whatever their source, would not even be discussed before this country and France had reached full agreement on the requirements for a true peace safeguarding their own security and that of the other free nations of Europe. And, second, that, after the conclusion of peace, while the assistance of other nations will be welcomed in the reconstruction of Europe, Anglo-French community of action will be maintained in all spheres so long as may be necessary to effect and consolidate this reconstruction. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 359, 39-44,
The Times, April 3, 1940, p. 8.

Lord Halifax, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the National Defense Public Interest Committee, London, April 11, 1940¹

. . . What is this civilization for which we are prepared to struggle, and, if need be, to give our lives? We do not always analyze the founda-

¹ Made following the invasion of Denmark and Norway.

tions of our thought, and when we do analyze them we sometimes hesitate to speak it, but I believe it is most certainly true that in the ultimate analysis our respect for our fellow man, and the respect we demand from him, spring from our belief that man is composed of an immortal soul placed in direct, conscious, and responsible relations with its Maker. It is from that source that flow, as it seems to me, the main conceptions of justice, of beauty, of truth, the faculty of distinguishing between right and wrong, and all the qualities that make life worth living and mark man off from the rest of the animal creation. Whether we consciously recognize it or not, it is on that foundation we have slowly, laboriously, painfully built the family, our free institutions, the free play of our intellect, our faith, our science, and our philosophy.

It is that great tradition that has been the capital on which European life for centuries has drawn. It was the basis of the Germany we used to know. It may be that Europe has often diverged from it in the past, but until now it has never been openly repudiated. Even revolutionary doctrines of the rights of man were ultimately based upon the concept of just that value of the individual soul. Nazism, as it has now revealed itself, is so hostile to the spiritual forces for which Christianity and all great religions stand that all alike must be concerned to resist its spread. To us, therefore, in this generation falls the task of defending the values of which we are custodians and without which, in my judgment, all hope of progress would be forever banished from the earth.

Lord Halifax, *The Heritage of Freedom*, p. 5-6,
The Times, April 11, 1940, p. 10.

Lord Lothian, Ambassador to the United States: Speech to the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, April 19, 1940

It is now more than eight months since the second world war of the twentieth century began. I feel that it is right that I, as the Ambassador of Great Britain to the United States, should try to put before you why we are against a patched-up peace, and the kind of peace we are fighting for. . . .

Why do the Allies go on fighting? Why are they uninfluenced by the many "peace offensives" which directly or indirectly come from Berlin? They are fighting, of course, first for their own existence. But they are also fighting because they are convinced that not only a victory by Nazi Germany but a truce with Nazi Germany now would be the end of most civilized values which Christianity and Western democracy have laboriously built up in recent centuries. . . .

Our first task, then, is to prove once and for all that the primary Nazi plan of campaign which seeks the rapid overthrow of France and Britain cannot succeed. Our second is to mobilize the immense resources at our command so as to be able either to knock out the Nazi power, or to convince the German people that the road to freedom and prosperity for themselves also is substitution for the Nazi regime of a government whose main purpose is not aggression and in whose word the rest of the world can trust. . . . The second is that it is sometimes said that we seek the breakup and destruction of the unity of the German peoples as an end in itself. That is not true. What we are fighting for is security, security for everybody against aggression and war, poverty and unemployment; security for Germany no less than for her neighbors and ourselves, if she abandons aggression, so that all nations will be free to live their own lives without fear, with secure access to the raw materials and markets of the world.

But we are clear that a peace at present would only play into the hands of despotism. It would be no more than a truce — a short interval between two world wars. Now that the battle has been joined, it must be fought out until one system or the other — the free way of life or the despotic way of life — has definitely and permanently a preponderance of power behind it. An indecisive peace would almost certainly mean a victory for the dictatorships, for it is the essence of the Nazi system that it is organized for instant war. Whereas the democracies genuinely demobilize in peace, so that it takes time to mobilize again, the Nazi system, by its nature is always ready for those lightning blows out of a relatively clear sky which have been Hitler's most successful method of aggression.

Personally I doubt whether the end of this war will see another great Peace Conference like the last. The basic conditions of the post-war world will be settled by the terms of the armistice, by the question of power, by the fact of where the preponderant power will lie at the time when the "Cease-Fire" sounds. . . .

There was a time, in the fifteen years after the Great War, when it was possible for Germany to argue that the French alliances in Eastern Europe were restrictive of Germany because they were the main support behind the discriminatory clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. But these alliances were also designed to protect the small nations of Eastern Europe from having their liberty and independence forcibly taken away from them. The need for them has become more clear now that they have gone, and Czechoslovakia and Poland are in consequence the prostrate victims of Nazi aggression. When France and Great Britain

say that they are interested in Eastern Europe they do not mean that they want to restrict any of Germany's natural rights there. What they mean is that, partly for reasons of their own security, they want to see Europe organized not as a number of prostrate peoples enslaved by the Gestapo but as a company of free nations united by some form of federal organization. . . .

We believe that we are fighting not only for our existence but to ensure that the basic institutions and ideals which have been guiding stars of Western civilization for the last 150 years shall not be wiped off the face of Europe and Asia and Africa by the military victory of the totalitarian dictatorships. . . .

The American Speeches of Lord Lothian, July 1939 to December 1940, New York, 1941, p. 71-87.

B. The National Government under Prime Minister Winston Churchill

(1) FROM MAY 10, 1940 TO THE FRENCH ARMISTICE WITH THE AXIS POWERS, JUNE 22, 1940

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, May 13, 1940

You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word. It is victory. Victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory, however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival. . . . No survival for the British Empire, no survival for all that the British Empire has stood for, no survival for the urge and impulse of the ages, that mankind shall move forward toward its goal. . . .

Parl. Deb Commons, vol. 360, 1501-2.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Broadcast, May 19, 1940

The British and French people have advanced to rescue not only Europe but mankind from the foulest and most soul-destroying tyranny that has ever darkened and stained the pages of history. . . . behind the armies and fleets of Britain and France gather a group of shattered States and bludgeoned races, the Czechs, the Poles, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Belgians, upon all of whom the long night of barbarism will descend unbroken even by a star of hope, unless we conquer, as conquer we must, as conquer we shall. . . .

B.I.N., 1940, XVII, p. 654-6.

King George VI: Broadcast on Empire Day, May 24, 1940

Let no one be mistaken. It is no mere territorial conquest that our enemies are seeking. It is the overthrow, complete and final, of this Empire and of everything for which it stands; and after that the conquest of the world. And if their will prevails they will bring to its accomplishment all the hatred and cruelty which they have already displayed. . . .

To all of us in this Empire, to all men of vision and good will throughout the world, the issue is now plain; it is the issue of life or death for us all.

Defeat will not mean some brief eclipse from which we shall emerge with strength renewed — it will mean destruction of our world as we have known it, and the descent of darkness upon its ruins.

I speak to you today with a new vision of this Empire before my eyes. Now that it has come into conflict and sharp comparison with the evil system which is attempting its destruction, its full significance appears in a brighter and more certain light. There is a word which our enemies use against us — Imperialism. By it they mean the spirit of domination and the lust of conquest. We free peoples of the Empire cast that word back in their teeth. It is they who have these evil aspirations. Our one object has always been peace. . . .

This peace they have taken from us, and they are seeking to destroy all that we have striven to maintain. Against our honesty is set dishonor, against our faithfulness is set treachery, against our justice brute force. There, in clear and unmistakable opposition lie the forces that now confront one another.

B.I.N., 1940, XVII, p. 653.

*Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, June 4, 1940*¹

Britain will carry on the struggle until in God's good time, the new world, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 361, 787–96; *The Times*, June 5, 1940.

Message from the United Kingdom Government to the Government of the French Republic, June 13, 1940

. . . We cannot measure the various forms of tribulation which will fall upon our peoples in the near future. We are sure that the ordeal by fire will only fuse them together into one unconquerable whole.

¹ Speaking after the evacuation of British forces from Dunkirk.

We renew to the French Republic our pledge and resolve to continue the struggle at all costs in France, in this land, upon the oceans, and in the air wherever it may lead us, using all our resources to the utmost limit, and sharing together the burden of repairing the ravages of war. We shall never turn from the conflict until France stands safe and erect in all her grandeur, until the wronged and enslaved States and peoples have been liberated, and until civilization is free from the nightmare of Nazism. That this day will dawn we are more sure than ever. It may dawn sooner than we now have the right to expect.

B I.N., 1940, XVII, p. 812-13.

Proposal for Franco-British Union, Communiqué of the United Kingdom Government, June 17, 1940

It was announced last night that, with the object of assisting France and supporting her to the utmost in the hours of stress through which she was passing, as also in the hope of encouraging the French Government to continue their resistance, His Majesty's Government offered to conclude a solemn Act of Union between the two countries.

The following draft declaration was accordingly communicated to the French Government by His Majesty's Ambassador on June 16:

THE DECLARATION OF UNION

At this most fateful moment in the history of the modern world, the Governments of the United Kingdom and the French Republic make this declaration of indissoluble union and unyielding resolution in their common defense of justice and freedom, against subjection to a system which reduces mankind to a life of robots and slaves.

The two Governments declare that France and Great Britain shall no longer be two nations but one Franco-British Union.

The constitution of the Union will provide for joint organs of defense, foreign, financial and economic policies.

Every citizen of France will enjoy immediately citizenship of Great Britain, every British subject will become a citizen of France.

Both countries will share responsibility for the repair of the devastation of war, wherever it occurs in their territories, and the resources of both shall be equally, and as one, applied to that purpose.

During the war there shall be a single War Cabinet, and all the forces of Britain and France, whether on land, sea, or in the air, will be placed under its direction. It will govern from wherever it best can. The two Parliaments will be formally associated.

The nations of the British Empire are already forming new armies. France will keep her available forces in the field, on the sea, and in the air. The Union

appeals to the United States to fortify the economic resources of the Allies and to bring her powerful material aid to the common cause.

The Union will concentrate its whole energy against the power of the enemy no matter where the battle may be.

And thus we shall conquer.

The Times, June 18, 1940, p. 6; *D A.F.R.*, II, p. 426.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, June 18, 1940

. . . The House will have read the historic declaration ¹ in which, at the desire of many Frenchmen, and of our own hearts, we have proclaimed our willingness to conclude at the darkest hour in French history a union of common citizenship. However matters may go in France or with the French Government or with another French Government, we in this island and in the British Empire will never lose our sense of comradeship with the French people. If we are now called upon to endure what they have suffered we shall emulate their courage, and if final victory rewards our toils they shall share the gains, aye, and freedom shall be restored to all. We abate nothing of our just demands — Czechs, Poles, Norwegians, Dutch, Belgians, all who have joined their causes to our own, shall be restored.

What General Weygand called the "Battle of France" is over. I expect that the Battle of Britain is about to begin. Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Upon it depends our own British life and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire. The whole fury and might of the enemy must very soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him all Europe may be free, and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands; but if we fail then the whole world, including the United States, and all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new dark age made more sinister, and perhaps more prolonged, by the lights of a perverted science. Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duty and so bear ourselves that if the British Commonwealth and Empire lasts for a thousand years men will still say "This was their finest hour."

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 362, 51-60;
The Times, June 19, 1940, p. 2.

¹ The communiqué offering union with France, June 17, 1940, see above, p. 185

(2) FROM JUNE 22, 1940 TO THE GERMAN INVASION OF THE
SOVIET UNION, JUNE 22, 1941

*Neville Chamberlain, Lord President of the Council: Broadcast, London,
June 30, 1940*

We are a solid and united nation which would rather go down to ruin than admit the domination of the Nazis. . . . Though we are left alone to defend freedom and civilization, brave men and women will only be braced by the knowledge that we must now rely upon ourselves, under Providence, to win through as we have won through before . . .

We shall be fighting for our own hearths and homes, and we shall be fighting with the conviction that our cause is the cause of humanity and peace against cruelty and persecution, of right against wrong; a cause that surely has the blessing of Almighty God.

The Times, July 1, 1940, p. 2.

*Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Broadcast Following the Naval
Battle at Oran and the Severing of Diplomatic Relations by the Vichy
Government, London, July 14, 1940*

Today is the Fourteenth of July, the National Festival of France. . . . I proclaim my faith that some of us will live to see a Fourteenth of July when a liberated France will once again rejoice in her greatness and in her glory, and once again stand forward as the champion of the freedom and the rights of man. . . .

Subject to the iron demands of the war which we are waging against Hitler and all his works, we shall try so to conduct ourselves that every true French heart will beat and glow at the way we carry on the struggle; and that not only France but all the oppressed countries in Europe may feel that each British victory is a step towards the liberation of the Continent from the foulest thralldom into which it has ever been cast. . . .

It has come to us to stand alone in the breach and face the worst that the tyrant's might and enmity can do. Bearing ourselves humbly before God, but conscious that we serve an unfolding purpose, we are ready to defend our native land against the invasion by which it is threatened. We are fighting by ourselves alone. But we are not fighting *for* ourselves alone. . . .

I stand at the head of a Government representing all parties in the State, all creeds, all classes, every recognizable section of opinion. We are ranged beneath the Crown of our Ancient monarchy. We are supported by a free Parliament and a free press. But there is one bond

which unites us all and sustains us in the public regard — namely, as is increasingly becoming known, we are prepared to proceed to all extremities, to endure them, and to enforce them. That is our bond of union. For this bond we shall keep nothing back and we shall go all lengths.

The Times, July 15, 1940, p. 5.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for War: Message of Welcome to the Czechoslovak Army after Its Arrival in England, July 14, 1940

. . . From those shores, from the high seas, from the air, and from every base of operations within the British Empire, we are resolved, with your valuable aid, to attack and overwhelm the forces of our common enemy; and we are further resolved never to relinquish that sacred cause until your beloved mother country, for which you have bled and suffered so long, has been restored once and for all to her own sons and daughters

News Flashes from Czechoslovakia, Release No. 47, August 20, 1940.

Lord Halifax, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Broadcast, July 22, 1940

Hitler ¹ has now made it plain that he is preparing to direct the whole weight of German might against this country. This is why in every part of Britain, in great towns and remote villages alike, there is only one spirit, a spirit of indomitable resolution. Nor has anyone any doubt that if Hitler were to succeed it would be the end, for many besides ourselves, of all those things which, as we say, make life worth living. . . . We shall not stop fighting till freedom, for ourselves and others, is secure.

What do we mean when we say that we are fighting for freedom? We want to be able to live our own lives as we like and not have to look over our shoulders all the time to see if the Gestapo is listening. We want to worship God as we like — and this religious freedom, based on conscience, we will not let go. . . . Bad faith, cruelty, crime become right by the fact that it is he, Hitler, who ordains them. That is the fundamental challenge of anti-Christ; which it is our duty as Christians to fight with all our power. The peoples of the British Commonwealth, along with all those who love truth and justice and freedom, will never accept this new world of Hitler's. Free men, not slaves; free nations, not German vassals; a community of nations freely cooperating for the

¹ Hitler's speech on July 19, 1940.

good of all — these are the pillars of the new and better order that the British peoples wish to see. . . .

This then is the spirit in which we must march together in this crusade for Christianity. We and our great Dominions overseas stand, and shall continue to stand, foursquare against the forces of evil

Lord Halifax, *The Heritage of Freedom*, p. 6, 7,
The Times, July 23, 1940, p. 15.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister, to General Charles de Gaulle, Leader of Free French National Committee: Agreement by Exchange of Letters Concerning the Organization, Employment and Conditions of Service of the French Volunteer Force, August 7, 1940

. . . I would take this opportunity of stating that it is the determination of His Majesty's Government, when victory has been gained by the Allied arms, to secure the full restoration of the independence and greatness of France.¹

U. K., France No. 2 (1940), Cmd. 6220, p. 2.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, Following the Agreement² with the United States Concerning the Lease of British Naval and Air Bases in the Western Hemisphere in Exchange for the Cession of American Destroyers, August 20, 1940

. . . A good many people have written to me to ask me to make on this occasion a fuller statement of our war aims, and of the kind of peace we wish to make after the war, than is contained in the very considerable declaration which was made early in the Autumn. Since then we have made common cause with Norway, Holland and Belgium. We have recognized the Czech Government of Dr. Beneš, and we have told General de Gaulle that our success will carry with it the restoration of France. I do not think it would be wise at this moment, while the battle rages and the war is still perhaps only in its earlier stage, to embark upon elaborate speculations about the future shape which should be given to Europe or the new securities which must be arranged to spare mankind the miseries of a third World War. The ground is not new, it has been frequently traversed and explored, and many ideas about it are held in common by all good men, and all free men.³ But before we

¹ Mr. Eden referred to this promise in the House of Commons on May 22, 1941 (*The Times*, May 23, 1941, p. 4).

² U. K., Cmd. 6224, Treaty Series No. 21 (1940)

³ See also speech by Lord Halifax in the House of Lords on the same day (*Parl. Deb. Lords*, vol. 117, 314-15).

can undertake the task of rebuilding we have not only to be convinced ourselves, but we have to convince all other countries that the Nazi tyranny is going to be finally broken. The right to guide the course of world history is the noblest prize of victory. . . .

There is, however, one direction in which we can see a little more clearly ahead. (He cites the Destroyer-Bases Agreement)

. . . Undoubtedly this process (of association of interests between Great Britain and the United States) means that these two great organizations of the English-speaking democracies, the British Empire and the United States, will have to be somewhat mixed up together in some of their affairs for mutual and general advantage. For my own part, looking out upon the future, I do not view the process with any misgivings. I could not stop it if I wished; no one can stop it. Like the Mississippi, it just keeps rolling along. Let it roll. Let it roll on full flood, inexorable, irresistible, benignant, to broader lands and better days

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 364, 1159-1171;
The Times, August 21, 1940, p. 2.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, September 5, 1940

. . . The House has no doubt observed . . . that Rumania has undergone severe territorial mutilation. Personally, I have always thought that the southern part of Dobrudja ought to be restored to Bulgaria, and I have never been happy about the way in which Hungary was treated after the last war. We have not at any time adopted, since this war broke out, the line that nothing could be changed in the territorial structure of various countries. On the other hand, we do not propose to recognize any territorial changes which take place during the war, unless they take place with the free consent and good will of the parties concerned. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 365, 40.

Lord Halifax, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the House of Lords, September 5, 1940

. . . I might perhaps explain to the House what attitude His Majesty's Government take towards this Rumanian-Hungarian settlement and towards other settlements reached under duress in time of war. We have, as your Lordships are well aware, never supported a policy based on a rigid adherence to the *status quo*. On the contrary, we have lent our support to the principle that we should be favorable to a modifica-

tion of the *status quo* always provided that such modification is just and equitable in itself and is reached by means of free and peaceful negotiation and agreement between the interested parties without aggression or compulsion. It is for that reason that His Majesty's Government are able to regard with satisfaction the conversations which have also been proceeding for some weeks between Rumania and Bulgaria in regard to the question of the Southern Dobrudja. It was stated on August 21st that Rumania had agreed in principle to the cession of this territory with its 1912 boundaries; and His Majesty's Government hope that from these discussions a final and amicable solution of that particular problem may be arrived at. It equally follows that we are unable to accept the settlement now announced of the Hungarian-Rumanian dispute over Transylvania since that settlement is the result of a dictation by the Axis Powers imposed on Rumania under duress. We do not propose during the war to recognize territorial changes unless these have been evidently and freely agreed between all the parties concerned. I have no doubt all of us in this House hope that at the end of war there may be general settlement on lines so just and equitable as to give hope of its durability and to that end His Majesty's Government will use all their influence. . . .

Parl. Deb. Lords, vol. 117, 367.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Broadcast after the Great Fire in the City of London Caused by Bombs, London, September 11, 1940

What he (Hitler) has done is to kindle a fire in British hearts, here and all over the world, which will glow long after all traces of the conflagrations he has caused in London have been removed. He has lighted a fire which will burn with a steady and consuming flame until the last vestiges of Nazi tyranny have been burnt out of Europe, and until the Old World and the New can join hands to rebuild the temples of man's freedom and man's honor on foundations which will not soon or easily be overthrown.

The Times, September 12, 1940, p. 4;
N.Y.T., September 12, 1940.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Broadcast to the Czechoslovak People on the Second Anniversary of the Munich Agreement, September 30, 1940

. . . In this hour of your martyrdom I send you this message. The battle which we in Britain are fighting today is not only our battle. It is also your battle, and, indeed, the battle of all nations who prefer liberty to a soulless serfdom. It is the struggle of civilized nations for the

right to live their own life in the manner of their own choosing. It represents man's instinctive defiance of tyranny and of an impersonal universe. . . .

It is because we both are fighting for the fundamental decencies of human life that we are determined that neither our struggle nor your struggle shall be in vain. It is for this reason that we have refused to recognize any of the brutal conquests of Germany in Central Europe and elsewhere, that we have welcomed a Czechoslovak Provisional Government in this country, and that we have made the restoration of Czechoslovak liberties one of our principal war aims. With firmness and resolution, two qualities which our nations share in equal measure, these aims will be achieved. Be of good cheer. The hour of your deliverance will come. The soul of freedom is deathless; it cannot, and will not, perish.

The Times, October 1, 1940, p. 3.

Clement R. Attlee, Lord Privy Seal: Report of Speech at the Trades Union Congress, Southport, October 8, 1940

The war was a conflict between the democratic principle and the autocratic principle, and we should win in so far as we drew strength from the unity of the people and the Government. . . .

What were the purposes of the Government? First of all, they had to defeat the enemy. . . .

In the third place, they had to preserve our freedom. . . .

Speaking as a member of the Government and realizing to the full the difficulties of the task, and not being a person given to easy optimism, he (Mr. Attlee) was profoundly convinced that this country was going to win. He was also profoundly convinced that out of this victory they could build a new world. Speaking as a Socialist, he believed profoundly that the principles of the Labor movement — freedom, democracy, collective security, and social justice — would enable us to build up a new world and establish peace on a firm foundation.

The Times, October 9, 1940, p. 9.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Broadcast to the French Nation, October 21, 1940

. . . You will excuse my speaking frankly, because this is not the time to mince words. It is not defeat that France will now be made to suffer at German hands, but the doom of complete obliteration. Army, Navy, Air Force, religion, laws, language, culture, institutions, literature, his-

tory, tradition — all are to be effaced by the brute strength of a triumphant army and the scientific low cunning of a ruthless police force. . . .

Remember, we shall never stop, never weary, and never give in, and that our whole people and Empire have vowed themselves to the task of cleansing Europe from the Nazi pestilence and saving the world from the new Dark Ages.

Do not imagine, as the German-controlled wireless tells you, that we English think to take your ships and Colonies. We seek to beat the life and soul out of Hitler and Hitlerism. That alone, that all the time, that to the end. We do not covet anything from any nation except their respect.

The Times, October 22, 1940, p. 4.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech at the Mansion House in London, November 9, 1940

. . . Let me remind you that, in spite of all the blows we have endured and under all the burdens we bear and amid so many deadly threats, we have not abandoned one jot of any of our obligations or undertakings towards the captive or enslaved countries of Europe, or towards any of those countries which still act with us.

On the contrary, since we have been left alone in this world struggle we have reaffirmed or defined more precisely all the causes of all the countries with whom or for whom we drew the sword — Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, greatest of all, France; latest of all, Greece. For all of those we will toil and strive, and our victory will supply the liberation of them all.

. . . It has been obvious to all that we are striving to the utmost of our strength for the freedom of nations against the oppressor, and that we are striving for the progress of peoples through the process of self-government and for the creation of that wider brotherhood among men which alone will bring them back to prosperity and peace.

Peace Aims, No. 31.

Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor and National Service: Speech to the Rotary Club, London, November 20, 1940

. . . I am sometimes asked, "What are your war aims?" My war aim is summed up in the first phrase I used, "the motive of our life must be social security." Why do I urge it? I am thinking of the suffering teeming millions in Europe and other parts of the world who, for the sake of

freedom, want us to be victorious but who are asking what is to be our attitude after. You have got to create a feeling of hope, a new and better economic outlook. . . .

Peace Aims, No. 30.

***Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons,¹
November 21, 1940***

. . . We are frequently asked to make declarations about our war aims. Some may think that example is better than precept, and that actions speak louder than words. Today in inaugurating a new Session of Parliament, we proclaim the depth and sincerity of our resolve to keep vital and active, even in the midst of our struggle for life, even under the fire of the enemy, those Parliamentary institutions which have served us so well, which the wisdom and civic virtues of our forbears shaped and founded, which have proved themselves the most flexible instruments for securing ordered, unceasing change and progress; which, while they throw open the portals of the future, carry forward also the traditions and glories of the past and which, at this solemn moment in world history, are at once the proudest assertion of British freedom and the expression of an unconquerable national will.

. . . Immense surrenders of their hard-won liberties have been voluntarily made by the British people in order to serve in time of war the cause of freedom and fair play, to which, keeping nothing back, they have devoted all that they have and all that they are. Parliament stands custodian of these surrendered liberties, and its most sacred duty will be to restore them in their fullness when victory has crowned our exertions and our perseverance. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 367, 26.

***Clement R. Attlee, Lord Privy Seal: Speech to the House of Commons,
December 5, 1940***

. . . Our aims are to try and establish a world of peace and of free peoples. That does not mean the kind of peace in which everybody is subdued to the will of one man or one nation. It means a peace of free peoples, such as we civilized peoples understand it and what we are asking for ourselves we are asking for all other nations. We are asking for an ordered peace. We realize that we cannot get peace by just washing our hands and letting the others go to the devil, because one has to take

¹ See also the debate on the Speech from the Throne, December 4 and 5, 1940. (*Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 367) and Mr. Duff Cooper's answer to an earlier debate in the House of Commons, October 15, 1940 (*Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 365, 674-6).

responsibility if one wants ordered peace. You have to replace anarchy of the world by ordered peace. We say you must base that ordered peace on social justice, and recognize how much the world degenerated after the last war just because there were false foundations. We want to build this world into a world of liberty, of giving the individual in every nation the opportunity of realizing to the full his or her personality . . . We believe that you can broaden and extend the principles which we adopt here. We have steadily extended that principle to the British Commonwealth and throughout the British Empire. We believe that we should expand further our political, personal and economic liberties. We cannot lay down the law to the rest of the world, and we do not want to do so. We can only say, "Here is our way of life and the best way we can advocate those principles is by striving more and more to live our principles of freedom and social justice here, and set an example to the rest of the world."

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 367, 754-6; *New Europe*, April 1941.

Lord Lothian, Ambassador to the United States: Speech to the American Farm Bureau Federation at Baltimore, December 11, 1940

. . . But the more people think about the future the more they are drawn to the conclusion that all real hope depends upon some form of cooperation between the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations. Even if we win a total victory there will be no chance of immediately creating an effective League of Nations. There will be nothing in Europe from which to make it. . . .

. . . The plain truth is that peace and order always depend not upon disarming the police but upon there being overwhelming power behind just law. The only place where that power can be found behind the laws of a liberal and democratic world is in the United States and in Great Britain supported by the Dominions and in some other free nations. The only nucleus round which a stable and peaceful and democratic world can be built after this war is if the United States and Great Britain possess between them more airplanes and ships of war and the key positions of world power, such as I have described, than any possible totalitarian rival. Then and then only will political and industrial freedom be secure, and will it be possible for a free economic system to prevail against the economics of totalitarianism. If we are to set the world going again, not only must we have strength, but we must not adopt the fatal policies we all pursued after the last war, the establishment of prohibitive tariffs, trying to collect fantastic reparations and war debts

across these tariffs, and then hoping to dodge the inevitable consequences of these follies by a policy of reckless lending. Markets and employment for all should be the main purpose of post-war economic policy. . . .

The American Speeches of Lord Lothian . . . p. 132-44; *Lord Lothian Speaks to America*, p. 97-109; *International Conciliation*, January 1941, No. 366, p. 9-19.

***Lord Halifax, Ambassador to the United States: Speech at the Pilgrims Luncheon, London, January 9, 1941*¹**

. . . The three things necessary for victory are a good cause, material strength to support it, and the people with spirit not unworthy of it.

As to the first, the issues have been restated with penetrating simplicity by Mr. Roosevelt in his fireside chat.² As regards materials, apart from the steady development in this country and in all parts of the Empire, we are able to count increasingly on the massive industrial strength of the United States, the value of which it is impossible to overestimate. Of the spirit of Britain's people it is hardly necessary to speak.

With the legend of Axis invincibility broken, we face the future with sober confidence. There is no hope for free human civilization unless the foundations of its life, now challenged, can be secured. We are encouraged by the knowledge that the will to resist this German attempt to secure world domination is as strong on the other side of the Atlantic as it is here.

Lord Halifax, *The Heritage of Freedom*, p. 10.

***Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the House of Commons, February 4, 1941*³**

His Majesty's Government would welcome the reappearance of an independent Ethiopian State and recognize the claim of the Emperor Haile Selassie to the throne. The Emperor has intimated to His Majesty's Government that he will need outside assistance and guidance. His Majesty's Government agree with this view and consider that any such assistance and guidance in economic and political matters should be the subject of international arrangement at the conclusion of peace.

¹ See also the speech by Prime Minister Churchill at the same luncheon (*The Times*, January 10, 1941, p. 9).

² *D. A. F. R.*, III, p. 17; and January 6, 1941 see section United States, p. 33.

³ An Agreement and Military Convention between Great Britain and Ethiopia were concluded on January 31, 1942. For details see *B.I.N.*, 1942, XIX, p. 138-40.

They reaffirm that they have themselves no territorial ambitions in Abyssinia. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 368, 804.

Clement R. Attlee, Lord Privy Seal: Speech to the House of Commons, February 12, 1941¹

. . . I am sure that there is a very wide and a growing agreement in this country as to the cause for which we stand. There is a growing understanding that we are fighting for a new world, not only for ourselves but for Europe and the civilized world. I think there is a growing realization of the close link between our political aims and our economic aims. There is a growing appreciation, as expressed in a number of documents I have seen, of the importance of bringing together our peace aims for the world outside this country and our peace aims for this country. It is one of the most encouraging things to find how this national unity in this war stress is expressing itself more and more in unity as to our peace aims and the realization of the kind of life for which we stand — the kind of life which is being threatened by Hitler. Therefore I do not at all dislike this matter being raised, in fact, I like it, but remember, we want a statement made, when it is made, that will make for unity in this country, unity with the Dominions and with the United States Government, and unity with all the civilized people who are in the struggle with us. Therefore it is a matter in which the right time must be chosen and the words must be chosen if we are to use them in the way they should be used, in order to bring about the end of the war and the establishment of peace.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 368, 1487, *Peace Aims*, No. 39.

Lord Halifax, Ambassador to the United States: Speech to the Pilgrims, New York, March 25, 1941

. . . We are wont to say that we are fighting for freedom and for democracy, for freedom as the quality of life that we desire, for democracy as the system of government which is at once its best expression and the surest guarantee for its protection.

What do we mean when we use these large words?

I can only tell you what I mean, and what I know my fellow countrymen mean, even if they do not always translate it into precise language, and I do not think you will take any different view.

¹ See also Prime Minister Churchill, February 11, 1941, *Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 368, 1222-23, 1368.

There seem to us to be certain principles which are essential to life as we wish to live it and see it lived, and those principles are now in dire peril, and we believe, therefore, that we are truly fighting for our lives, since life to us is worthless if the principles on which it is built are to be destroyed.

We do well to remind ourselves what these principles are, for they, like the iceberg, of which the greater part is out of sight, lie deep down below the surface of man's outward being.

And I would state thus, what in varying forms is in many minds today:

First, the religious principle of the absolute value of every human soul;

Second, the moral principle of respect for personality and for conscience;

Third, the social principle of individual liberty. This finds its expression in two ways; in the sphere of politics through equal opportunity, justice, and the rule of law; economically, through the direction of national effort to the creation of conditions that may bring some real security into the daily life of the humblest citizen;

And, finally, the *domestic* principle of the sanctity and solidarity of the family, which is the natural development of the individual, and I venture to say that unless we build on these foundations, the religious, the moral, the social and domestic, we have no hope of finding the way of happiness.

It is only by slow process that man has learned to apprehend these principles. They have come to him by Christianity and by other great religions. They have drawn vitality from the best of human thought all through the centuries. For us they are expressed and protected by democracy, and that is why we value it. There are, of course, other nations, who have different systems of government, but who are not less concerned than ourselves to secure the way of life which these principles reflect; and this is because it is on their maintenance that rights fundamental to human life and progress plainly rest.

From those principles, I believe, derive rights that, following your Declaration of Independence more than one hundred and fifty years ago, and following also that historic speech of your President ten days ago,¹ I would assert for all men today:

The right to think, speak and act freely within the law, and to have free access to the thoughts of others;

The right of free association, both national and international, with their fellow men;

¹ See *D. S. Bul.*, IV, p. 277.

The right to live without fear of aggression, injustice or want;

The right to believe and worship as conscience may dictate.

It is the vindication of those rights that men today passionately desire. . . .

It is not possible, of course, now, to draw detailed plans for the future structure of the community of nations. These must naturally await discussion in free council by those concerned, but we are already in a position to see the basis on which agreement must be founded. Nations, like individuals, can only exist in freedom and security if they are prepared to cooperate for mutual economic welfare and, if need be, for mutual defense. In the economic sphere indeed, everything depends upon such cooperation. But no party to such an association as we picture will be ambitious to dominate its partners. Every nation, great or small, will have its place and make its own contribution.

And moreover, past experience teaches us that a stable international order must admit of ordered change in the relations between states. Just as the liberty of the individual must have regard to the needs of the community, so must every nation in future accept its obligations to the general family of nations. All rights, whether personal or national, are always morally linked with duties. The spirit that impels a good citizen to give willing service in one form or another to the State, will imply for the nation a readiness in both political and economic spheres to consider the welfare of its neighbors.

We, for our part, are prepared to join hands with any State which genuinely seeks the peace and prosperity of the world by loyally observing engagements and by ensuring individual liberty within its borders. It will be of no value to force unwanted associations upon unwilling nations. We must rather try to create conditions, political and economic, in which there may grow among the peoples themselves a real, vital sense of their community of interest. . . .

In many respects the world must be treated in the future as a single whole. Since the last war we have seen an increasing difficulty in securing the distribution of the world's abundance both within and across national frontiers, with adverse effects upon the workers' standard of living everywhere. We had hoped to see the vision of plenty banishing the spectre of scarcity; but what in fact we have seen has been the failure of men to exchange with their fellow men the abundant products of both farm and factory. When therefore victory has been won, it must be our aim to promote the common interest in the greatest possible interchange of goods and services. Problems involving common needs can only be solved by common action.

We see the urgent need for economic cooperation, and we are ready to take part in plans to promote it on a world-wide scale. Our aim will be prosperity justly shared. Even now we are making plans to remedy the impoverishment which must follow in the train of war. We are arranging to establish stocks of food and raw materials which can be released as soon as we can be sure that they will be used for this work of healing and not for our destruction.

This business of rebuilding after the war will be, of course, a task far beyond the strength of any single country. Great Britain is resolved to do her utmost, but it is clear that if the world is to be brought back to health after so devastating a sickness, it will only be by the united action of all men and all nations of good will.

It will not be easy, for we may be very sure that the upheaval now convulsing the nations will not leave things as they were. A new world is being born, as we speak, of bitter suffering, and the problems of peace will be in many ways more difficult than the problems of war. New needs will demand new remedies, and there will be room alike for all the courage and imagination of youth, and all the clear thinking of experience that can be rallied to the task.

In this war Great Britain seeks no selfish end. Its immediate cause, as in 1914, was the German breach of a treaty on the one hand, and the fulfillment of a treaty by Great Britain on the other. The ultimate cause was Germany's lust for world power, and her concentration of her resources for the single purpose of military conquest, and therefore it must be our aim in the present war to convince the people of Germany — the people of Germany — that these traditional ambitions and methods do not pay.

One of the greatest tragedies of this time is that for years German youth has been impelled by its rulers to the pursuit of spurious ideals and the worship of false gods. The gulf that has thus been dug between them and our own younger generations will take time to bridge. And therefore after the war is over, and until we can be satisfied of Germany's cooperation, I can hardly doubt that nations resolved to preserve both peace and freedom must needs retain sufficient armed strength to make their will effective.

I dare to hope that in this as in other matters our two peoples will appreciate the immense responsibility that will jointly rest upon them; and that, in the words of Pascal, "We may combine justice and power, making what is just strong, and what is strong, just." So, I think, may the spirit of our cooperation deserve and win the support of all other peoples like-minded with ourselves, to strengthen the foundations of world_society.

Thus only will it be possible to ensure that neither Germany nor any other nation shall revert, or has any reason to revert, to those policies which have plunged Europe into five wars within the last eighty years.¹

U. K., Cmd. 6264, London, 1941; *The Pilgrims, Speeches at a Dinner in Honor of the Viscount Halifax*, New York, 1941, p. 9-25; *N.Y.T.*, March 26, 1941.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech at a Luncheon Given in Honor of John G. Winant, Ambassador to Great Britain, by the British Employers' Confederation and the Trades Union Congress, London, March 27, 1941

... As for the future, I have always been a bit shy of defining war aims, but if these great communities, now struggling not only for their own lives but for the freedom and progress of the world, emerge victorious there will be an electric atmosphere in the world which may render possible an advance towards a greater and broader social unity and justice than could otherwise have been achieved in peace-time in a score of years. We are not theorists or doctrinaires. Trade unionists are practical men aiming at practical results. I might say that our aim will be to build a society in which there will be wealth and culture, but where wealth shall not prey on commonwealth nor culture degenerate into class and pride.

The Times, March 28, 1941, p. 2.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech on Occasion of Review of the Czechoslovak Army in England, April 19, 1941

... Great Britain will never cease from the war with all her energies, with all the resources of the Empire. She will never cease or draw back from the struggle until she has means to secure the effective liberation and restoration of Czechoslovakia.

I-A.R., 1941, I, 5, p. 8.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Broadcast to the Polish People on Poland's 150th Constitution Day, May 3, 1941

... The presence here of your Government and armed forces has enabled us to get to know each other better and to build a foundation for Anglo-Polish relations after our common victory and the restoration of your freedom. ...

¹ See also Lord Halifax's press interview, March 26, 1941 (*N.Y.T.*, March 27, 1941), and his speech to the English Speaking Union, New York, April 15, 1941 (*Reprint from Brit. Library of Information*, p. 6; *N.Y.T.*, April 16, 1941).

The end will reward all toil, all disappointment, all suffering in those who faithfully serve the cause of European and world freedom. The day will dawn, perhaps sooner than we now have a right to hope, when the insane attempt to found a Prussian domination on racial hatred, on the armored vehicle, on the secret police, on the alien overseer, and on still more filthy Quislings, will pass like a monstrous dream.

And in that morning of hope and freedom not only the embattled and at last well-armed democracies, but all that is noble and fearless, in the New World, as well as in the Old, will salute the rise of Poland to be a nation once again

I-A.R., 1941, I, 4, p. 12.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Letter to Johan Nygaardsvold, Norwegian Prime Minister, May 17, 1941

I write to send you my greetings on the occasion of the Norwegian National Day and the 127th anniversary of the Norwegian Constitution. This Constitution enshrines the cardinal principles of national independence, individual liberty and rule of law for which the British Commonwealth, Norway and our Allies are fighting today.

Although for your countrymen in Norway suffering under wicked Nazi domination, their National Day must this year be one of sorrow rather than of rejoicing, their spirit I know is unbroken and their faith in these principles unshaken. They share with us and the people of the United States of America the resolve that law, freedom and self-government shall not perish from the earth. I look forward to happier days to come when Norwegians and other peoples now under German oppression will celebrate such days in peace and prosperity.

News of Norway, 1941, I, 20, p. 3.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech at the Mansion House in London, May 29, 1941

. . . My first words must be to welcome the great message broadcast a few hours ago by the President of the United States,¹ in which he described with incomparable breadth of vision, the scope of the struggle in which we are engaged. That speech is a momentous world event. By his words the President has given resolute expression to the fixed determination of the most powerful nation on earth. He defined the settled policy of his country in terms which are as vigorously encouraging to us as they must be disheartening to our enemy. To give effect to this policy the President has decreed a state of unlimited national emer-

¹ See section United States, p. 40.

gency in the United States. For our part, we have listened with hearts full of thankfulness to the President's determination that the cause of freedom can and will prevail.

"We do not accept, and will not permit, this Nazi shape of things to come." In these historic words the President expresses the determination of all the freedom-loving countries.

Perhaps the keynote of the President's speech lies in his repeated declaration that the national existence of free nations must ultimately depend upon the freedom of the seas. This freedom has been maintained in the past by the British and American Navies and both countries have fought on many occasions to preserve it. Freedom to trade, he has declared, is essential to the economic life of America.

This applies with equal force to the British Empire, for without ability of the ships of the world to sail freely on their lawful occasions, no modern nation can hope to maintain its commercial or political freedom. The President has pointed the way for the free nations of the world. He has done more, he has accomplished a great act of faith and statesmanship.

. . . Hitler has destroyed the bases of political and social cooperation throughout Europe and he is destroying her economic structure. The future of Europe will depend upon how moral and material reconstruction is brought about throughout the world.

While all our strength is concentrated on winning the war, His Majesty's Government have naturally been giving careful thought to this all-important matter, which has been equally in the mind of the President of the United States of America.

We have found in President Roosevelt's message to Congress in January 1941 the keynote of our own purposes.

[Mr Eden quoted "the four freedoms."¹]

On this occasion I will not attempt to elaborate our views about the President's first and second freedoms: Freedom of speech and thought, and the freedom to worship God, save to say that we realize that these freedoms are fundamental to human development and to democratic responsibility.

Nor do I today intend to discuss the political questions involved in giving real effect to President Roosevelt's "freedom from fear." I will only say that, as I hope to show this afternoon, as His Majesty's Government intend to strive in cooperation with others to relieve the post-war world from the fear of want, so will they seek to ensure that the world is freed from fear.

¹ See section United States, p. 33.

Today I wish to put before you certain practical ways in which "freedom from want" may be applied to Europe.

We have declared that social security must be the first object of our domestic policy after the war. And social security will be our policy abroad not less than at home. It will be our wish to work with others to prevent the starvation in the post-armistice period, the currency disorders throughout Europe, and the wide fluctuations of employment, markets and prices which were the cause of so much misery in the twenty years between the two wars. We shall seek to achieve this in ways which will interfere as little as possible with the proper liberty of each country over its own economic fortunes.

The countries of the British Empire and their Allies, with the United States and South America, alone are in a position to carry out such a policy. For, irrespective of the nature of the political settlement, continental Europe will end this war starved and bankrupt of all the foods and raw materials which she was accustomed to obtain from the rest of the world. She will have no means, unaided, of breaking the vicious circle. She can export few goods until she has, first of all, received the necessary raw materials. Wasteful war-time cultivations in many lands will leave agriculture almost as weak as industry. Thus Europe will face the vast problem of general demobilization with a general lack of the necessary means to put men to work.

Let no one suppose, however, that we for our part intend to return to the chaos of the old world. To do so would bankrupt us no less than others. When peace comes we shall make such relaxations of our war-time financial arrangements as will permit the revival of international trade on the widest possible basis. We shall hope to see the development of a system of international exchange in which the trading of goods and services will be the central feature. I echo Mr. Hull's admirable summing up in his recent declaration,¹ when he said:

"Institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and continuous development of all countries and permit payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries."

However, to meet the problems of the immediate post-war period action in other directions will also be required. The liberated countries, and maybe others, too, will require an initial pool of resources to carry them through the transitional period.

To organize the transition to peaceful activities will need the collab-

¹ See section United States, p. 39.

oration of the United States, of ourselves, and of all free countries which have not themselves suffered the ravages of war. The Dominions and ourselves can make our contribution to this because the British Empire will actually possess overseas enormous stocks of food and materials, which we are accumulating so as to ease the problems of the overseas producers during the war, and of reconstructed Europe after the war. The Prime Minister has already made clear the importance he attaches to this.

.

No one can suppose that the economic reorganization of Europe after the Allied victory will be an easy task. But we shall not shirk our opportunity and our responsibility to bear our share of these burdens. The peaceful brotherhood of nations, with due liberty to each to develop its own balanced economic life and its characteristic culture, will be the common object. But it is the transition to this end which presents the problem. It is the establishment of an international economic system, capable of translating the technical possibilities of production into actual plenty, and maintaining the whole population in a continuous fruitful activity, which is difficult. The world cannot expect to solve the economic riddle easily or completely. But the free nations of America, the Dominions and ourselves alone possess a command of the material means, and, what is perhaps more important, these nations clearly have the will and the intention to evolve a post-war order which seeks no selfish national advantage: an order where each member of the family shall realize its own character and perfect its own gifts in liberty of conscience and person. We have learned the lesson of the interregnum between the two wars. We know that no escape can be found from the curse which has been lying on Europe except by creating and preserving economic health in every country.

Under a system of free economic cooperation Germany must play a part. But here I draw a firm distinction. We must never forget that Germany is the worst master Europe has yet known. Five times in the last century she has violated peace. She must never be in a position to play that role again. Our political and military terms of peace will be designed to prevent a repetition of Germany's misdeeds. . . .

The right economic outcome after the war requires on our part no exceptional unselfishness, but will require constructive imagination. It is obvious that we have no motive of self-interest prompting us to the economic exploitation either of Germany or of the rest of Europe. This is not what we want nor what we could perform. The lasting settlement and internal peace of the continent as a whole is our only aim. The fact

that at the bottom of his heart every combatant knows this is the ultimate source of our strength. To every neutral satellite or conquered country it is obvious that our victory is, for the most fundamental and unalterable reasons, to their plain advantage. But that victory stands also for something greater still. Only our victory can restore, both to Europe and to the world, that freedom which is our heritage from centuries of Christian civilization, and that security which alone can make possible the betterment of man's lot upon the earth. . . .

U. K., Misc., No. 2 (1941), Cmd. 6289; *N.Y.T.*, May 31, 1941.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech to Representatives at Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London, June 12, 1941

In the twenty-second month of the war against Nazism, we meet here in this old Palace of St. James's, itself not unscarred by the fire of the enemy, in order to proclaim the high purposes and resolves of the lawful constitutional governments of Europe whose countries have been overrun, and we meet here also to cheer the hopes of free men and free peoples throughout the world. Here before us on the table lie the title deeds of ten nations or states whose soil has been invaded and polluted and whose men, women and children lie prostrate or writhing under the Hitler yoke. But here also, duly authorized by Parliament and the democracy of Britain, are gathered the servants of the ancient British monarchy and the accredited representatives of the British dominions beyond the seas, of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, of the Empire of India, of Burma and of our colonies in every quarter of the globe. They have drawn their swords in this cause. They will never let them fall till life is gone or victory is won. . . .

. . . It will not be by German hands that the structure of Europe will be rebuilt or union of the European family achieved. . . . We cannot yet see how deliverance will come or when it will come, but nothing is more certain than that every trace of Hitler's footsteps, every stain of his infected, corroding fingers will be sponged and purged and, if need be, blasted from the surface of the earth.

We are here, your Excellencies, to affirm and fortify our union in that ceaseless and unwearying effort which must be made if the captive peoples are to be set free. . . .

. . . we proclaimed at that very time [after the fall of France] to all men, not only to ourselves, our determination not to make peace until every one of the ravaged and enslaved countries was liberated and until the Nazi domination was broken and destroyed. . . .

U. K., Cmd. 6285, Misc., No. 1 (1941), London, 1941;
I-A. R., 1941, I, 5, p. 5-6.

(3) FROM JUNE 22, 1941 TO THE JAPANESE ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR, DECEMBER 7, 1941

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Broadcast from London on the Occasion of the Invasion of Russia by Germany, June 22, 1941

. . . None can doubt what our policy will be. We have but one aim, and one single irrevocable purpose. We are resolved to destroy Hitler and every vestige of the Nazi regime, from this nothing will turn us — nothing. We will never parley, we will never negotiate with Hitler or any of his men. We shall fight him by land, we shall fight him by sea, we shall fight him in the air, until, with God's help, we have rid the earth of his shadow and liberated his people from his yoke.

Any man or State who fights against Nazism will have our aid. Any man or State who marches with Hitler is our foe. . . .

That is our policy. . . . It follows, therefore, that we shall give whatever help we can to Russia and the Russian people. We shall appeal to all our friends and Allies in every part of the world to take the same course and pursue it as we shall, painfully and steadfastly to the end. . . .

B I.N., 1941, XVIII, p. 820.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the House of Commons during Discussion on German Invasion of U.S.S.R., June 24, 1941

. . . At a time like this our thoughts go out with heartfelt sympathy to our Polish ally. Once again, their soil is a battlefield. Once again their people suffer for no fault of their own. The Polish people have had a hard history. By their courage in a time of unparalleled ordeal, they have earned and they will redeem their freedom. That remains our pledge. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 372, 975.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech at Leeds,¹ July 5, 1941

. . . The foundations of peace are constant vigilance and sufficient armed strength to strike and overwhelm any possible aggressors. It must be no scrap of paper to be torn to shreds, while those charged with its observance stand aside indifferent or preoccupied. It is here in Britain that we must lay the foundations of a new Europe . . . here that the future of men's hopes must and will be fashioned amid the sights

¹ See also Mr. Eden's speech at the Foreign Press Association Luncheon, London, July 29, 1941 (*Peace Aims*, No. 45).

and sounds of war . . . a dual task confronts us — to win the war and win the peace. We seek no material gain . . . we claim neither territory nor prize. We have but one aim, to break the power of the tyrant Hitler so that the nations may be free to work together to build a saner, happier world in security and at peace. To this end we dedicate our work and our lives. . . .

B.I.N., 1941, XVIII, p. 926.

***Agreement for Joint Action by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the War against Germany, Signed at Moscow, July 12, 1941*¹**

Agreement for joint action by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in the war against Germany: —

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have concluded the present Agreement and declare as follows:

1. The two Governments mutually undertake to render each other assistance and support of all kinds in the present war against Hitlerite Germany.

2. They further undertake that during this war they will neither negotiate nor conclude an armistice or treaty of peace except by mutual agreement.

[Signature and Protocol omitted. Effective without ratification.]

U. K., Cmd. 6304. *Soviet Union*, Treaty Series No. 15 (1941); Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, July 14, 1941, No. 1; *D. S. Bul.*, V, p. 240; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 252.

Declaration, with the U.S.S.R., to Turkey,² Ankara, August 10, 1941

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom confirm their fidelity to the Montreux Convention,³ and assure the Turkish Government that they have no aggressive intentions or claims whatever with regard to the Straits.

His Majesty's Government, as also the Soviet Government, are prepared scrupulously to observe the territorial integrity of the Turkish Republic.

¹ For Prime Minister Churchill's statement in the House of Commons about this agreement see *B.I.N.*, 1941, XVIII, p. 998.

² For oral explanation of British views presented by the Ambassador, see *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 687. A Declaration in identical terms was presented by the Soviet Ambassador to the Turkish Foreign Office on the same day.

³ League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, CLXXIII, p. 213.

While fully appreciating the desire of the Turkish Government not to be involved in war, His Majesty's Government, as also the Soviet Government, would nevertheless be prepared to render Turkey every help and assistance in the event of her being attacked by a European power.

B.I.N., 1941, XVIII, p. 1079.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Broadcast on the Atlantic Charter,¹ August 24, 1941

. . . There are, however, two distinct and marked differences in this joint declaration from the attitude adopted by the Allies during the latter part of the last War, and no one should overlook them.

The United States and Great Britain do not now assume that there will never be any more war again. On the contrary, we intend to take ample precaution to prevent its renewal in any period we can foresee by effectively disarming the guilty nations while remaining suitably protected ourselves. The second difference is this: that instead of trying to ruin German trade by all kinds of additional trade barriers and hindrances, as was the mood of 1917, we have definitely adopted the view that it is not in the interests of the world and of our two countries that any large nation should be unprosperous or shut out from the means of making a decent living for itself and its people by its industry and enterprise. These are far-reaching changes of principle.

. . . Above all it is necessary to give hope and the assurance of final victory to those many scores of millions of men and women who are battling for life and freedom or who are already bent down under the Nazi yoke. . . .

British Library of Information; *Peace Aims*, No. 47;
D.A.F.R., IV, p. 210.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech at Coventry Following the Entry of British and Soviet Troops into Iran, August 30, 1941

. . . We shall, as soon as military conditions permit, withdraw our forces from Iranian territory. Neither we nor the Soviet Government wish to seize any part of Iran.

Speaking recently I said that our policy towards Germany after the war must have a twofold purpose. On the one hand, Germany must be placed in conditions in which it will be impossible for her again to rearm and to resume the struggle for domination over peace-loving nations. We have had enough of that from Germany. On the other hand, it is

¹ See section United Nations, p. 2.

equally important that she should not become a source of poison to her neighbors and to the world by economic collapse. Today I would go a step further. These two fundamental principles must govern not only our relations with Germany after the war but all international relations. This is the plain meaning of the Roosevelt-Churchill Declaration. No nation must ever be in a position to wage aggressive war against her neighbors. Secondly, economic relations must be so regulated that no nation can in future be starved out of its proper economic position by autarchic methods of trade arbitrarily imposed.

Peace Aims, No. 48.

Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor and National Service: Broadcast to the United States on Labor Day, September 1, 1941

. . . British labor will never fight an Imperialist war. . . .

. . . The ultimate emancipation of the people depends upon their right to work out their own destiny stage by stage. Working people can never rise to their full stature under a system dependent upon autocracy or dictatorship. They must win it through a labor movement, organized and united under a free democratic system. We all have our national characteristics, a great cause unites us. The trade unions cut right across the factors that divide humanity. They unite all peoples irrespective of race, color, or religion. . . .

The Times, September 2, 1941, p. 2, *N.Y.T.*, September 2, 1941.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Commons, Atlantic Meeting with President Roosevelt, September 9, 1941

I have, as the House knows, hitherto consistently deprecated the formulation of peace aims or war aims — however you put it — by His Majesty's Government, at this stage. I deprecate it at this time, when the end of the war is not in sight, when the conflict sways to and fro with alternating fortunes and when conditions and associations at the end of the war are unforeseeable. But a Joint Declaration by Great Britain and the United States is an event of a totally different nature. Although the principles in the Declaration, and much of the language, have long been familiar to the British and American democracies, the fact that it is a united Declaration sets up a milestone or monument which needs only the stroke of victory to become a permanent part of the history of human progress. . . .

First, the Joint Declaration does not try to explain how the broad principles proclaimed by it are to be applied to each and every case, which will have to be dealt with when the war comes to an end. It

would not be wise for us, at this moment, to be drawn into laborious discussions on how it is to fit all the manifold problems with which we shall be faced after the war. Secondly, the Joint Declaration does not qualify in any way the various statements of policy which have been made from time to time about the development of constitutional government in India, Burma or any other parts of the British Empire. We are pledged by the Declaration of August 1940,¹ to help India to obtain free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth with ourselves, subject, of course, to the fulfilment of obligations arising from our long connection with India and our responsibilities to its many creeds, races and interests. Burma is also covered by our considered policy of establishing Burmese self-government and by the measures already in progress. At the Atlantic meeting, we had in mind primarily, the restoration of the sovereignty, self-government and national life of the States and nations of Europe now under the Nazi yoke, and the principles governing any alterations in the territorial boundaries which may have to be made. So that is quite a separate problem from the progressive evolution of self-governing institutions in the regions and peoples which owe allegiance to the British Crown. We have made declarations on these matters which are complete in themselves, free from ambiguity and related to the conditions and circumstances of the territories and peoples affected. They will be found to be entirely in harmony with the high conception of freedom and justice which inspired the Joint Declaration.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 374, 67-82; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p 213.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Statement on British Policy with Respect to Syria,² to House of Commons, September 9, 1941

We have no ambitions in Syria. We do not seek to replace or supplant France or substitute British for French interests in any part of Syria. We are only in Syria in order to win the war. However, I must make it quite clear that our policy, to which our Free French Allies have subscribed, is that Syria shall be handed back to the Syrians who will assume at the earliest possible moment their independent sovereign rights.

We do not propose that this process of creating an independent Syrian Government or Governments shall wait until the end of the war. We contemplate constantly increasing Syria's share in the administration. There is no question of France maintaining the same position which she

¹ *Indian Information*, VII, August 15, 1940; see also p. 284

² See also statement by General Catroux, section Fighting France, p 567.

exercised in Syria before the war and which the French Government had realized must come to an end. On the other hand, we recognize that among all the nations of Europe the position of France in Syria is one of special privilege.

There must be no question even in war-time of a mere substitution of Free French interests for Vichy French interests. The Syrian people want to come back into their own. This is fully recognized in the documents which have been exchanged between the Minister of State and the representative of the Free French.

I was asked a question about our relations with Iraq. They are special, and our relations with Egypt are special; and in the same way I conceive that France will have special arrangements with Syria. The independence of Syria is a prime feature in our policy.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 374, 76.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Statement to the Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London, September 24, 1941

The second resolution which I have to put before you today deals with the practical steps which must be taken in order to provide for the supply of necessities to the occupied territories as soon as the German oppressors have been removed.

Speaking at the Mansion House on May 29,¹ I observed that as long ago as August of last year the Prime Minister emphasized the importance of building up reserves of food all over the world, so that the peoples of Europe might have the present certainty of its speedy entry into their countries immediately the Nazi power was shattered. The Prime Minister's statement has been developed by the Minister without Portfolio,² who has declared on more than one occasion that when we have freed the peoples of Europe, we must be in a position to help to feed and clothe them and to restart the wheels of industry. Looking forward to a Europe liberated from fear and from want, I have also observed that in the transition from war to peace an initial pool of resources will be needed; and that it is the duty of all free countries to organize such a pool in good time and to create the channels through which, when the moment comes, its flow to Europe may be directed.

¹ See p. 202.

² Mr. Greenwood was appointed as Minister without Portfolio to study reconstruction and post-war problems on January 6, 1941 (see *Peace Aims*, No. 34); see also his broadcast on January 13, 1941 (*Peace Aims*, No. 35), his speech in the House of Commons on March 19, 1941 (*Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 370, 248-54) and Prime Minister Churchill's statement in the House of Commons, January 22, 1941 (*ibid.*, vol. 368, 264).

It is to organize in good time the action required to give effect to this policy that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has invited the Allied Governments and authorities to meet here today. In this, as in so much else, we may confidently hope that the great nation across the Atlantic, as well as other friendly nations, will in due course lend their cooperation. But it is our direct responsibility. I invite you now to consider how best to advance our common aim.

As most of the representatives here today are aware, some preliminary work has already been done. There is already established a Ministerial Committee on Export Surpluses, of which the Minister without Portfolio is Chairman, and a committee of British Government officials under the Chairmanship of Sir Frederick Leith-Ross, chief economic adviser to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom. So far these Committees have in the main been concerned with the arrangement of purchases, mostly within the British Empire, of commodities which, as a result of the war and of the war-time exigencies of shipping, have become surplus to current demand. Such purchases have been on a substantial scale and cover a fairly wide range of goods. They have been made primarily for the immediate purpose of stabilizing the economics of the territories concerned, but we have been mindful also of their value as a potential relief store for the European peoples, who are at present being systematically denuded of their resources by a ruthless enemy. The two Committees which I have named have therefore also started inquiries as to probable European needs. Only a beginning has been made. For true estimates of such needs the Governments of the countries concerned must of course be the authorities; so, also, it will be for them to consider at the appropriate time how far they may wish to draw upon any stocks which are being acquired and held by the Governments of the British Empire. Certain of the Allied Governments have also already taken action with the immediate post-war relief of their peoples in view and have been in touch with Sir Frederick in regard to their plans. The Netherlands Government, following the announcement some months ago of Her Majesty Queen Wilhelmina, has taken positive measures to build up a relief store for their country. The Polish and Belgian Governments have prepared preliminary memoranda on the estimated requirements of their countries in the immediate post-war period, and the Norwegian and Czechoslovak Governments have informed us that they are putting in hand the preparation of corresponding memoranda.

His Majesty's Government welcomes this spirit of initiative since we recognize that it is primarily the function of each Government and authority to be responsible for the reprovisioning and rehabilitation of its

country. Our concern today is to agree to the first necessary steps to insure that the initiatives severally taken shall so far as possible be brought into accord with a common plan for the general good. How shall we set about it? What practical program of action are we to devise? There are four principal features of such a program: At the outset a comprehensive survey must be made of probable requirements in the order of their urgency, and data must be collected regarding potentially available supplies. A broad scheme of long-distance transport must be planned well in advance. Gradually reserve stocks must be organized in the most convenient places. In due course the administration and finance of their transfer to Europe and of their further distribution must be arranged.

The framing and coordination of estimates of probable requirements is the first task. It is not easy to assess what may be the more and the less urgent needs of individual countries in the unpredictable circumstances of their release from enemy domination. But some estimates must be made, and they can later be revised in the light of changing circumstances. Such estimates must take account of the urgent needs in the first weeks after the Nazi yoke is lifted from the destitute peoples for whose relief supplies will have to be rushed to Europe; they must further take account of the probable demands of European countries for supplies from overseas in order to restore their economies to working order during a period of reorganization, which is likely to last at least two years after the war. It is only if the interested governments and authorities maintain continuous contact with one another through a central bureau that estimates can be coordinated and a practical working approach made to a survey of the needs of all on a common basis. This is the ground from which springs the proposal in the resolution for the establishment of a bureau which will report to an Inter-Allied Committee under the chairmanship of Sir Frederick.

The importance of estimates prepared by the bureau is clear when we consider the need to plan ahead the possibilities for moving goods from overseas. Shipping will be the crux of the physical problem of transfer; and a broadly unified scheme will have to be prepared if delay and congestion are to be avoided, and if no one country is to be prejudiced for lack of adequate facilities. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom will in this regard contribute all that is within their power. Other Allied Governments will wish, I am certain, to contribute to the extent of their shipping resources. And the shipbuilding yards of the United States will not, as we know, have been idle. Once again coordination is vital. Quantities of goods from particular sources must be re-

lated to quantities of tonnage and particular shipping routes; a balance must be maintained between supplies from nearer and from more distant sources as deliveries proceed. The British Ministry of War Transport has already been considering what shipping might be available. In this connection of course not much can be done until the estimates of requirements have been made. We can, however, express our common intention to arrange that our merchant fleets shall be utilized as fully as possible for the relief and reconstruction of the countries of Europe when they are liberated. This intention is expressed in the resolution before you.

It is too early, before the steps are taken which I have mentioned, to raise the large question of the organization of reserve stocks. But there will fortunately be little difficulty in most cases about the existence of the supplies required. Stocks of certain essential foodstuffs and basic materials are even now accumulating in those parts of the world not directly ravaged by war. Some, as I have said, have been acquired by the Governments of the British Commonwealth, by the Allied Governments, and by other producing countries; and large quantities remain in the hands of private producers and merchants. The yield of the season 1941-42, added to present stores, will secure that in such cases the granaries and warehouses shall be full. In other cases the demands from the stricken countries will be so great that it will tax the resources of the world to organize sufficient supplies for relief purposes. In such cases, clearly most careful coordination of purchasing and distribution will have to be effected. These, however, are matters for subsequent consideration by the interested governments and authorities. It will be to their mutual advantage to consult with one another in maturing their plans, and a suitable organization for this purpose can be set up as and when required.

There remain, finally, complex problems of finance and administration in connection with the actual transfer of supplies for the relief and reconstruction of Europe. We can leave these problems for the present; they arise only at a later stage of our efforts. It is proposed that we shall start with first things first; namely, an agreed declaration on shipping policy, the establishment of a bureau to survey requirements, and of an Inter-Allied Committee to deal with the proposals of the bureau. By this means effective collaboration amongst ourselves will be assured.

Such collaboration alone, however, will not be enough. It is obvious that the satisfaction of the post-war needs of Europe will also depend upon the cooperation of the great primary producing countries overseas.

We have therefore already approached the Governments of the Dominions and of the United States of America and informed them of our immediate plans and of our hopes. The presence here today of the Dominion representatives, and the association of the Dominion Governments with the resolution, is substantial proof that we can count upon the invaluable help of these Governments.

As regards the United States of America, I am sure that all those present will share my great satisfaction at the encouragement we have already received at this stage from the United States Government, who through their Ambassador has authorized me to make the following statement at the meeting on their behalf:

The Government of the United States has been advised of the purpose of this Meeting and acquainted with the terms of the draft resolution which is to be presented for consideration. It has requested the United Kingdom Government to state to this meeting its opinion that the undertaking is of great prospective usefulness. It understands that the present discussions will be of an exploratory nature and states that it stands ready at the appropriate time to consider in what respects it can cooperate in accomplishing the ends in view.

It has pointed out that any plans that may be worked out are of great potential interest to the United States for various reasons. They might affect the current American defense effort. According to their substance, form, and method they might also affect commercial policies and relationships and even broader post-war arrangements. For these reasons it makes the request that it be kept fully advised regarding the course of these exploratory discussions and that it be consulted regarding any plans which might emanate therefrom.

I have, of course, been very happy to give the United States Ambassador an assurance that the United States Government will be kept fully informed of the discussions at and arising out of this meeting and of the work accomplished by the bureau and the Inter-Allied Committee, and that they will be consulted before any concrete plans are decided upon. We have also previously had some contact with the United States Government in regard to the treatment of surplus production and we know that they are deeply interested in planning for the coordination of stocks and marketing of some of the most important commodities, especially wheat and cotton.

The statement which they have authorized me to make on their behalf shows that they will not be unwilling at the right time to join in framing the plans for the supply of Europe's needs on a basis of cooperation. It is clear that some joint marketing arrangements will be required both from the point of view of producers and consumers. Wasteful and costly competition in acquiring stocks and the violent price movements which would result from such competition should be avoided, and nothing

must be allowed to prevent a fair allocation of supplies reaching the countries which may most need them but be least able to compete for them.

I now propose to put before you, for your approval, a resolution ¹ to serve as the starting point for that concerted action without which we cannot hope to bridge the gap between war and a lasting peace. We do not propose to play the grim game of "beggar my neighbor." Our declared purpose is to insure that with freedom there will come succor, at the earliest possible moment, to the distressed peoples of Europe.

No one can know when this war will end, and we should make our preparations in good time. The measures which we take now, measures which we make known that we have taken, may bring some encouragement to the millions in Europe whose present sufferings we cannot prevent, and give them strength of heart to endure, and, where they can, to resist.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 18-23;
I-A. R., 1941, I, 9, p. 7-8

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Final Remarks at Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London, September 24, 1941

. . . This is in fact the first attempt by the Allied Governments, working together, to lay the foundations for the reconstruction of Europe after the war. It is their answer to Hitler's New Order and to the measures he has taken to deprive the peoples of Europe of their means of existence. Here working together in London, we are setting up an organization which, far from depriving any peoples of the means of livelihood, is designed to supply them with the necessities of life when they have been freed from German domination. I regard this as a step of the greatest importance and am very grateful for the reception it has received. . . .

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941); I-A. R., 1941, I, 9, p. 11.

Clement R. Attlee, Lord Privy Seal: Speech before the National Defense Public Interest Committee, London, October 15, 1941

. . . When the war is over, those who are responsible for these atrocities must not escape punishment; but besides punishment there is reform. One of the hardest tasks which will have to be undertaken after this war is the reform of the survivors of the generation of the German people

¹ See section United Nations, p. 4.

which has been deliberately trained in barbarism, has been deliberately debauched and decivilized by the Nazi regime.

It is no good imagining that we can get peace in the world unless we see to it that until there is absolute proof of a change of heart, these people are kept in a position in which they cannot again do harm.

After the last war, grave mistakes were made. Germans who genuinely desired a change were not sufficiently encouraged. Germans who desired again to set the world at war were not sufficiently restrained from the means of doing evil. We must not repeat that mistake. . . .

. . . The Principle that there must be in the world force to support the rule of Law has been reaffirmed in the Atlantic Charter — that Charter which, put forward by the two great leaders of Britain and the United States, has now been accepted by all the Allies as embodying the principles for which we are fighting. . . .

. . . The only way to preserve peace is to bind together all the peace-loving peoples and endow them with a force sufficient to prevent aggression. It may be that the old League of Nations will not be recreated; but I am certain that its principles must be applied, if we are to have a peaceful and ordered world. . . .

Britain Plans, p. 6.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Statement on Execution of Hostages by the Nazis, London, October 25, 1941

His Majesty's Government associate themselves fully with the sentiments of horror and condemnation expressed by the President of the United States¹ upon the Nazi butcheries in France. These cold-blooded executions of innocent people will only recoil upon the savages who order and execute them. . . . The atrocities in Poland, in Yugoslavia, in Norway, in Holland, in Belgium, and above all behind the German fronts in Russia, surpass anything that has been known since the darkest and most bestial ages of mankind. They are but a foretaste of what Hitler would inflict upon the British and American peoples if only he could get the power.

Retribution for these crimes must henceforward take its place among the major purposes of the war.

Britain Plans, p. 7; *B.I.N.*, 1941, XVIII, p. 1840.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech at Manchester, October 25, 1941

We are aware of the weight and the burden of the sacrifices we shall have to accept after the war. But we have made up our minds to

¹ See section United States, p. 53.

shoulder our international responsibilities courageously and conscientiously, and to answer, for our part, the call which Mr Welles himself has made to the citizens of the United States. I look forward with confidence to an association with the United States of incalculable value not only to ourselves, but to the whole world besides. Herein lies, surely, the greatest hope for the future. . . .

Britain Plans, p. 6.

Clement R. Attlee, Lord Privy Seal: Speech at the International Labor Conference, New York, October 30, 1941

. . . I speak to you today as a member of a British War Cabinet. . . .

A War Cabinet is necessarily concerned in the main with the immediate responsibilities of carrying on war. Far-reaching decisions have to be taken from day to day, not only on matters of war strategy in the light of the information which it alone possesses, but on every kind of problem, for it is of the essence of modern war that it affects every department of Government, it affects the lives of every citizen.

These decisions and the actions consequent upon them produce changes in the economic structure of the country and in the position and social habits of the citizens, the effects of which cannot be limited to the period of the war. Some measures are of transient effect but others may carry far-reaching consequences into the post-war era. No hard and fast line can be drawn between the war and the post-war periods. Naturally, therefore, the British Government has had to give some of its attention not only to the immediate problems which will arise on the cessation of hostilities, but to those long-term problems of the post-war settlement which will arise when victory has been won, for we do not envisage any end to this war save victory.

But we are determined not only to win the war but to win the peace. Plans must be prepared in advance. Action must be taken now if the end of the war is not to find us unprepared. My colleague, Mr. Arthur Greenwood, has been specially charged with this task, but the problems of the peace cannot be solved by one nation in isolation. The plans of a post-war Britain must be fitted into the plans of a post-war world, for this fight is not just a fight between nations, it is a fight for the future of civilization. Its result will affect the lives of all men and women — not only those immediately engaged in the struggle. It is above all, as is so well understood in our country, a fight on behalf of the common people in every country who seek to preserve or to secure those four freedoms of which the President of the United States has so finely spoken. . . .

It was therefore a peculiar satisfaction to the British Government that it has been found possible to hold this Conference of the International Labor Organization. The British Government has always advocated that its activities should be carried on to the fullest extent which the war allowed, and should be in the position to play its full part in the formulation of the economic and social work of peace. . . .

. . . the clauses of that (Atlantic) Charter form a coherent body of principles which are not separate but complementary. If, as I believe, it is a necessary condition for the establishment of continuing peace that its economic foundations should be well and truly laid, it is equally true that this cannot be secured unless the fear of aggression is removed. It is certain that until the crushing burden of armaments throughout the world is lifted from the backs of the people, they cannot enjoy the maximum social well-being which is possible. We cannot build the city of our desire under the constant menace of aggression. Freedom from fear and freedom from want must be sought together. . . .

We wish to see free peoples freely cooperating to make their particular contributions to our common civilization, but we recognize that just as in a city or state the freedom of the individual is secured by the enforcement of the rule of law so in the modern world, so closely linked together, acceptance of a law superior to the will of the individual state is a condition of freedom. . . . Our task is to work out a system whereby economic and political freedom is preserved by preventing its abuse by any. The conception of labor standards lies at the root of economic prosperity and industrial stability. . . . We have to see to it that when we utilize the discoveries of science and the bounty of Nature to obtain a great volume of production we do not stultify our efforts by failing to provide for its consumption by those who need it. The maintenance of labor standards is a powerful means towards this end and is also an instrument for introducing into economic processes a greater measure of stability. Here, again, we must beware of allowing our desire for stability and security to stifle initiative or for our enthusiasm for development to destroy security. . . . the orderly production of commodities is necessary in order to avoid over- or underproduction and catastrophic changes in price which are destructive of our economic life and social security. But it is essential that all such arrangements should be based not on the creation of scarcity but on the utilization of abundance.

In his most interesting report, the Acting Director has called attention to the significance of the emergence of the social objective and its incorporation in a notable statement of principles made by the leaders of two great democracies, and he has rightly stressed the change in pub-

lic opinion in the last twenty years indicated by it. The joint expression of aims common to the United States and British Commonwealth of Nations known as the Atlantic Charter, which has since been endorsed by many other nations, includes not only purposes covering war but outlines of more distant objectives. It binds us to endeavor with due respect to our existing obligations to further the enjoyment by all states, great and small, victors or vanquished, of access on equal terms to trade and raw materials which are needed for their economic prosperity. In addition, it records our desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all labor standards economic advancement and social security. But it is not enough to applaud these objectives, they must be attained. And if past mistakes are to be avoided, there must be the closest international collaboration in which we in the United Kingdom will gladly play our part.

I agree with the view recently expressed by Mr. Sumner Welles, that planning for the post-war period cannot be left until the end of the war, and we are, therefore, in the United Kingdom considering our plans now. We are determined that economic questions and questions of the universal improvement of standards of living and nutrition shall not be neglected as they were after the last war owing to preoccupation with political problems.

Those whose joint efforts will in due course surely overthrow Hitlerism must collaborate no less closely when that object has been achieved. They must not be content with destroying the Nazi system of tyranny and oppression. They must continue to work together so as to build up a world of freedom and security.

The fact is that wars do not enrich but impoverish the world, and bold statesmanship will be needed if we are to repair the ravages of war and to ensure to all the highest possible measure of labor standards, economic advancement, and social security, to which the Atlantic Charter looks forward.

So far as we can see now, the measures to be taken will fall into two categories — first, urgent measures to relieve want and meet difficulties in the immediate post-war period; and secondly, longer term arrangements for the future. Methods which may be appropriate and even necessary in the interim period will not necessarily be the best as the basis for a long-term policy, but the two stages will overlap and cannot be kept in water-tight compartments.

Plans must be prepared for meeting the immediate post-war needs of Europe, and having regard to the vastness of the problem, international

cooperation will clearly be essential to bring those plans to fruition. It will be no less essential for the practical realization of our hopes for a more secure and prosperous future for mankind.

To carry out the principles of the Atlantic Charter which we have taken as an expression of the things for which we fight, will require the earnest cooperation of all nations and of all men and women of good will. It will demand hard thinking in order that the ideal may be brought within the range of the practical, for there are many things which can be done now and there are things which are being done now.

There will always be sceptics who say that high aims proclaimed in times of stress will be forgotten when the emergency is past. Action is the best way to convince these doubters. . . .

U. K., Cmd. 6331, *Report to the Minister of Labour*,
London, 1942, p. 15-18.

Arthur Greenwood, Minister without Portfolio: Speech to the House of Commons, November 25, 1941

. . . The first task that we shall have to undertake at the end of the war, the first task that will face the free Governments as they return to their own lands after the war, will be the feeding, the clothing, and the housing of their peoples. The question of post-war relief is a task of first importance, of first magnitude, and of the greatest urgency. . . .

To restore Europe's capacity to live by her own efforts will mean far more than clothing and feeding those people who have been freed from the Nazi yoke. . . . While we must keep abreast of the problems, there is a great responsibility not merely on the Government but on all people and on all kinds of organizations to make their active contributions to the solution of these problems by the new methods for which the time calls. . . . The Government will always cooperate with organized and responsible bodies of opinion in the solution of their great tasks. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 376, 717-19; *Britain Plans*, p. 9.

Leopold C. M. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India: Speech celebrating Yugoslav Union Day, December 2, 1941

. . . The precise form under which union (Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes) is restored is not for me to discuss. What matters more than legal form is the unity of spirit. There is only one thing I would add: You will need unity, after this struggle is over, not only within your own borders but with your neighbors. The fatal error of policy after the last war was to leave the mighty mass of the German people, humiliated, revengeful, still dreaming of domination, confronted by a group of disconnected

smaller nations, without giving these latter time either to consolidate their own national life or to adjust their mutual differences in some form of wider union.

Without some such wider combination and reconciliation of the nations of Central and South Eastern Europe, there can be no real equality, no real independence, either in the economic or the political field, between them and their more massive neighbors.

The Times, December 3, 1941.

(4) FROM PEARL HARBOR TO DECEMBER 31, 1942

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Address to the Congress of the United States, Washington, December 26, 1941

Here we are together, defending all that to freemen is dear. . . . If we had kept together after the last war; if we had taken common measures for our safety, this renewal of the curse need never have fallen upon us. Do we not owe it to ourselves, to our children, to tormented mankind, to make sure that these catastrophes do not engulf us for the third time?

It has been proved that the pestilences may break out in the Old World which carry their destructive ravages into the New World, from which, once they are afoot, the New World cannot by any means escape. Duty and prudence alike command, first, that the germ centres of hatred and revenge should be constantly and vigilantly surveyed and treated in good time; and, secondly, that an adequate organization should be set up to make sure that the pestilence can be controlled at its earliest beginnings before it spreads and rages throughout the entire earth.

Five or six years ago it would have been easy, without shedding a drop of blood, for the United States and Great Britain to have insisted on the fulfillment of the disarmament clauses of the treaties which Germany signed after the Great War. That also would have been the opportunity for assuring to the Germans those raw materials which we declared in the Atlantic Charter should not be denied to any nation, victor or vanquished. . . .

D. S. Bul., V, p. 573-8.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Broadcast after His Return from Moscow, London, January 4, 1942

. . . The experience of my visit, the talks that I had with Mr. Stalin and Mr. Molotov, have convinced me that closer political collaboration

between us can and will be realized. We cannot ignore the difficulties. We have to get rid of a legacy of suspicion on both sides. There is the contrast in forms of government. But I will never accept that this need divide us. What matters in foreign affairs is not the form of internal government of any nation but its international behavior.

The trouble with Hitler, for instance, was not that he was a Nazi at home. The trouble with him was that he would not stay at home. He was and is a ruthless aggressor with an insatiable appetite for world dominion. He cannot tolerate free and independent nations and no free nation will be secure so long as he lives and the German military power is unbroken.

Contrast this with Russia's attitude and our own. The Soviet Union is determined upon the utter defeat of Germany; so are we. The Soviet Union is determined to do all that is in its power to ensure that Germany cannot launch further wars upon the world; so are we. Out of the untold human suffering of the present war the Soviet Union wishes to gain a lasting peace for all its peoples; so do we. For these common objects we must work together to win the war and to win the peace.

The Times, January 5, 1942, p. 3; *N.Y.T.*, January 5, 1942.

Treaty of Alliance between the United Kingdom,¹ the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Iran, Signed at Tehran, January 29, 1942²

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah of Iran, on the other;

Having in view the principles of the Atlantic Charter jointly agreed upon and announced to the world by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on the 14th August, 1941, and endorsed by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the 24th September, 1941, with which His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah declares his complete agreement and from which he wishes to benefit on an equal basis with other nations of the world; and

Being anxious to strengthen the bonds of friendship and mutual understanding between them, and

Considering that these objects will best be achieved by the conclusion of a Treaty of Alliance;

¹ See statement by Anthony Eden on the treaty, *Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 377, 1155-6.

² Entered into force on day of signature.

Have agreed to conclude a treaty for this purpose and have appointed as their plenipotentiaries; . . .

ARTICLE 1. His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (hereinafter referred to as the Allied Powers) jointly and severally undertake to respect the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and political independence of Iran.

.

ARTICLE 5. The forces of the Allied Powers shall be withdrawn from Iranian territory not later than six months after all hostilities between the Allied Powers and Germany and her associates have been suspended by the conclusion of an armistice or armistices, or on the conclusion of peace between them, whichever date is the earlier. The expression "associates" of Germany means all other powers which have engaged or may in the future engage in hostilities against either of the Allied Powers.

ARTICLE 6. (i) The Allied Powers undertake in their relations with foreign countries not to adopt an attitude which is prejudicial to the territorial integrity, sovereignty, or political independence of Iran, nor to conclude treaties inconsistent with the provisions of the present Treaty. They undertake to consult the Government of His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah in all matters affecting the direct interests of Iran.

(ii) His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah undertakes not to adopt in his relations with foreign countries an attitude which is inconsistent with the alliance, nor to conclude treaties inconsistent with the provisions of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE 7. The Allied Powers jointly undertake to use their best endeavors to safeguard the economic existence of the Iranian people against the privations and difficulties arising as a result of the present war. On the entry into force of the present Treaty, discussions shall be opened between the Government of Iran and the Governments of the Allied Powers as to the best possible methods of carrying out the above undertaking.

.

ANNEX 1

Identic Notes Addressed to the Iranian Minister for Foreign Affairs (Soheily) by His Majesty's Minister (Bullard) and the Soviet Ambassador (Smirnov), January 29, 1942

. . . I have the honor . . . to assure Your Excellency that my Government . . . consider themselves bound not to approve anything at any

.

such (peace) conference which is prejudicial to the territorial integrity, sovereignty or political independence of Iran, and not to discuss at any such conference anything affecting the direct interests of Iran without consultation with the Government of Iran.

His Majesty's Government . . . will further do their best to secure that Iran will be represented on a footing of equality in any peace negotiations directly affecting her interests.

U. K., Cmd. 6335, Persia No. 1, 1942; *D. S. Bul.*, VI, p. 249;
D.A.F.R., IV, p. 681-6.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Statement to the House of Commons, February 3, 1942

I am happy to be able to inform the House that an Agreement was signed on behalf of His Majesty's Government with the Emperor of Ethiopia on January 31st at Addis Ababa. . . . This Agreement restores our normal diplomatic relations with the Emperor. . . . The Emperor has asked us for technical advisers, and we have agreed to do our best to produce the services of a small number of British officials. It will be their duty to assist the Emperor with their counsel in the restoration of his administration. It is expected that the currency of the Agreement will be two years. . . .

. . . The financial arrangements . . . have been designed to ensure that the dependence of Ethiopia upon a foreign country shall not be perpetuated. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 377, 1052-4; *Britain Plans*, p. 11.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Statement to the House of Commons, February 4, 1942

. . . The Agreement between Greece and Yugoslavia¹ was signed in the Foreign Office on January 15th, and I am glad to have this opportunity of welcoming an Agreement which cements the friendly relations already existing between two Allied Governments and which affords a basis for a future Balkan Confederation. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 377, 1156-7.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech on Accepting a Gift for the Forces from the Free Austrians in Great Britain, London, February 18, 1942

Austria was the first victim of Nazi aggression. We can never forget the charm, beauty and historic splendor of Vienna, the grace of life, the

¹ See p. 535.

dignity of the individual . . . The people of Britain will never desert the cause of freedom for Austria from the Prussian yoke . . . Only our own follies can deprive us of victory, and in the victory of the Allies Free Austria shall find her honored place.

The Times, February 19, 1942, p. 2.

Agreement for Mutual Aid Pursuant to the Lend-Lease Act of March 11 1941 between the United Kingdom and the United States, February 23, 1942

[For text see United Nations, p 10]

Agreement between United Kingdom and Greece, London, March 9, 1942

[For text see Greece, p 538.]

P. Noel-Baker, Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of War Transport: Speech to the House of Commons, March 19, 1942

. . . The pledges of the Atlantic Charter are of fundamental importance to the future of the shipping industry. The Atlantic Charter talks of opening free access to trade to all States, great or small, victor or vanquished after the war, in order to promote their economic prosperity. It says that the Governments are all going to work together in the economic field to promote international trade, raise labor standards, promote economic advancement and social security. It has been proved that our Government and the Government of the United States desire to make these pledges a reality by the new Lease-Lend arrangements they made the other day.

. . . Anyone who thinks we can go back to the 1939 world, to international unrest, competitive national armaments, national economic autarchy, latent or active economic or military war — anyone who thinks we can go back to all that and still have a really prosperous shipping industry, is living in a fool's paradise, or perhaps I had better say, a fool's inferno. Even under those conditions we should have to try and do better for shipping than before. But if the Governments of the world can manage their reconstruction aright, we can make of the shipping industry, and of the noble profession of the sea, a far finer thing than it has ever been before.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 378, 1745-6; *Britain Plans*, p. 16.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech before the Danes in London on the Second Anniversary of the German Invasion of Denmark, April 9, 1942¹

. . . I feel I must say with very good confidence that the day of liberation for Europe can be looked and hoped for by all those whose nations are in bondage at the present time. We will never give in, we will never weary. . . . We will never pause in the struggle, nor will our great American and Russian allies. I have very little doubt the day will come when Denmark will be free from the grip in which she has been held and will resume her independent, honored, ancient place among the great peoples and states of Europe.

I-A. R., 1942, II, p. 76.

Sir Kingsley Wood, Chancellor of the Exchequer: Speech before the House of Commons, April 14, 1942

. . . One of the primary objectives of our post-war policy must be therefore the greatest possible expansion of international trade. No country can have a greater interest than we in such an objective. It follows that we have a vital interest in the prosperity of other nations, which is the first condition of that general prosperity on which the flow of international trade depends.

This also should be said: If we are to overcome the difficulties and dangers of the post-war period, we must regulate the pent-up demand, and not allow it to be dissipated, as it was after the last war, in the wastage of an inflationary boom. The more one studies the likely post-war situation, the more apparent it becomes that, for a variety of reasons, it would be entirely wrong to contemplate that the financial and economic controls which serve our war effort can be swept away by a stroke of the pen at the conclusion of hostilities. This cannot be so. The ordinary reversal of the present concentration of import programs, domestic manpower and productive activity on the prosecution of the war, the need to improve our post-war balance of trade by a marked expansion of exports, the shipping situation with which the world will be confronted at the end of the war, and the need to finance our post-war reconstruction at the lowest possible rates of interest, are merely examples to show that there should be no sudden abandonment of many of our war-time financial and economic controls. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 379, 126-7.

¹ The sum of £38,300 was given by the Danes for airplanes.

Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor and National Service: Speech to I.L.O. Emergency Committee, London, April 20, 1942

. . . There has been no other institution evolved internationally in which it has been found possible to incorporate representative elements and governments meeting in common council in the same way that it has been achieved through the machinery of the International Labor Office. It may well serve as a pointer to the parliament of man, particularly if the other factors of the League, the political and the economic, are redesigned in a world organization, open in its discussions as this one is, clear in its conclusions and actuated by similar motives. May it not be possible that the International Labor Office together with a similar economic and political organization may be woven into a pattern each complementary to the other? . . .

This is a people's war . . . therefore it must be a people's peace. . . .

. . . There can be no decent basis of society but by a two-way traffic from the land to industry and industry to the land and the standard between the two must be on a just and correct equilibrium. . . .

. . . As soon as the "cease fire" sounds, there may be a danger of tremendous reaction. It is, I suggest, then that the statesmen of the world and all those responsible for the leadership of mankind must stand together resolutely and hold on to some form of controls while the foundation of peace, stability and orderly development is being worked out. . . .

I trust, therefore, that the International Labor Office will be able to approach this problem in such a way that it will get the Governments and the great industrial leaders of all States to recognize this essential fact and so be able to suppress any sudden desire for immediate gain on either side and devote themselves to the real task of laying a solid foundation — and what a task, when you realize the terrible devastation in Russia, Eastern Europe, and in China where the land fighting has been on so great a scale and when you consider how much further that devastation may extend. . . .

No country can afford at the end of this struggle to be blinded by its own limited interest, nor can it make its contribution to the future progress of the peoples of the world unless it is prepared to look at the problems of the world as a whole. . . .

. . . The endeavor to find a solution brings people together in a manner that nothing else does, as is shown in the world of science and the arts. If you can remove the sheer fear arising from national barriers and create confidence in the world of industry and primary production, and

if the objective that you want to reach is clear, namely, the raising of the standard of life of the people as a whole, then everyone gains in the ultimate solution and human relationship is enhanced in the process of finding it. . . .

No one person or organization or State can produce a complete solution. What is needed is to get our objective clear and accept certain fundamental principles such as those expressed in clause 5 of the Atlantic Charter:

They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all, improved labor standards, economic adjustment and social security.

This is something to strive for, but that does not apply to one country, it applies universally, irrespective of color or race. It really means the end of exploitation as we knew it in the nineteenth century.

Now to achieve this end, mere revolutionary upheaval will not do. It would probably have the effect of setting us further back. It takes so long to rebuild. What it does mean is the facility to harness the experience and knowledge of men and women who are studying these problems and who are of good will, and to bring them into the common pool. Then reduce them down to simplicity, in order that out of them basic principles can be applied, subject to adaptation in the various parts of the world.

The main objective must be cooperation to get rid of misery and insecurity, to give universal education, universal knowledge, to tear out from our history books the things that prejudice one people against another; to teach the idea that all have a contribution to make to human progress. In that task I know of no organization that has a greater opportunity than the International Labor Organization. It has the capacity to meet the new needs. It can be a great uniting force against all those institutions and tendencies which have sought hitherto to divide peoples.

International Labour Review, XLVI, p. 3-4 (July 1942);
Britain Plans, p. 19.

Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord Privy Seal: Broadcast, May 3, 1942

. . . Those peoples who have not yet attained their political freedom like the Indian peoples, desire that freedom as a first step to the working out of their own economic destiny. That right we recognize. Other nations desire to throw off autocracy or foreign domination, yet others desire to see their political democracy turned into an economic democracy where the power of vested interests and finance will give way to the

rights of the common people. All these desires are greatly sharpened by the events of war, and by the happenings of this war in particular.

This is in reality a peoples' war, a peoples' war of liberation. Each one of us is right in the front line, each one of us is partaking to the full — or we should be — in the dangers and the efforts which mark its prosecution. And so we all claim the right to have a say in what shall happen after the war because we are fighting not only to prevent our country being subjected to the cruel brutality of Hitlerism but also to create after the war a better and happier world for all — not merely for some privileged sections of humanity

Nationally and internationally we want to see a world consciously planned for better standards of living for the great masses of the people, whether British, Russian, American, Chinese, or of any other race.

The interests of individual nations must give way, in some matters at least, to those of the wider community — whether the European or the world community of nations, and so too the interests of the individual in each country will have to yield to the interests of the community as a whole.

This new spirit must find practical expression in our international relations and in the economic and social field at home. We must, therefore, begin to work out its implications, coolly and scientifically, so that we may apply it in action when the time comes for reconstruction after our victory. . . .

Whatever else we may do we must hold tenaciously to the new freedom and to the new comradeship which has been born, and prepare ourselves to translate them into actual terms of better social and economic conditions for the other man — the mass of our fellow countrymen.

There must be, after this war, none of those gross inequalities that were the aftermath of the last war, none of that disgraceful contrast of great poverty and great wealth, and no vast bands of heroic defenders of our country walking the streets in the vain search of a livelihood . . .

It can hardly be doubted that if these things are to be avoided the responsibilities of the State must grow. But the State — however powerful and efficient — cannot do all . . .

Britain Plans, p. 23.

Joint Statement on Madagascar of the Admiralty and War Office, London, May 5, 1942¹

. . . It has been made clear to the French authorities in Madagascar that the United Nations have no intention of interfering with the French

¹ Following the landing of British and Free French troops on Madagascar

status of the territory, which will remain French and will continue to be part of the French Empire. . . .

Britain Plans, p. 24.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech at Usher Hall, Edinburgh, May 8, 1942

. . . I am speaking to you as Foreign Secretary. And when, as Foreign Secretary, I think of the world after the war I am thinking, primarily, of how we shall be able to keep the peace. For me that is the fundamental problem. But it is the fundamental problem for all of us. For without peace, without stability in international relationships, without active cooperation between the peoples of the world, without the removal of the constant threat of war, there is no hope for us anywhere. Without peace we cannot rid ourselves of the recurring scourge of unemployment. Without peace we must look forward to ever-falling standards of living, to ever-increasing social stress.

When I speak of peace I do not mean simply the absence of war. When Germany and Japan are defeated, whether it be this year, or next, or whenever it may be, the war will come to its end. But that will not mean peace in the sense in which I am using the word. It is only then, when the war is over, that we shall begin to make peace

When the war comes to an end we shall be faced with the problem, but we shall not have solved it. That will be for the future, and for the long future. We cannot win peace in a day. We cannot win peace in the months of a conference. We cannot win it even in a peace treaty, however careful your draftsmanship.

These are the bones, the skeleton of peace. Only human will and perseverance can give them flesh and blood. We can only build up peace over long years of effort, of vigilance, above all of determination, of will. We did not make peace last time. How shall we make it now?

First of all I would say, and it is not a hard saying, that we must make sacrifices for peace. It is one of the laws of life, and we need not be afraid of it, that you do not get something for nothing. Everything has to be paid for somehow, at some time. We have learned that, if we have learned nothing else, in the past 25 years. And the first thing that we have to do is to understand, as we did not understand before, that we have a direct and inescapable responsibility for peace at all times. That is a responsibility which is not ours alone. We share it with the other nations of the world.

We have continually to revise our understanding of geography. Before ever this war began the world was shrinking before our eyes. The war has accelerated that process. The world after the war will be a still smaller place. There will be no room for isolation, no room for selfish policies or unneighborly policies. There will be but one village street from Edinburgh to Chungking. . . .

Peace is more than frontiers and peace treaties. There must be force and will as well. But peace is more than force. And you will never have peace on this earth unless you have an economic system in which men and women who are willing to work are able to work and find the reward of their labors.

I said just now that there could be no social advancement without peace. But it is equally true that you will not get peace without social improvement. If there are 3,000,000 unemployed here, and countless millions of unemployed in Europe and America and Asia, you will not get peace. If there is unemployment and malnutrition and animal standards of life, and poverty that can be remedied is not remedied, in any part of the world, you will jeopardize peace.

There is first a fundamental need. The United Nations together must possess sufficient force to provide the police to prevent highway robbery and the success of gangster methods. We have to aim at a state of affairs in which the four great world powers represented by the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States of America, the U.S.S.R., and China will together sustain this peace system. In peace they will look for aid from other peace-loving countries, just as they do now in war. But upon them must fall the main burden for the maintenance of peace and the main responsibility for the economic reconstruction of the world after the war.

What is true of our foreign relations is also true of our Colonial Empire. You cannot run a large Colonial Empire well unless you are determined to do so, and unless you are proud to make the necessary sacrifices to carry through the task.

I have not concealed from you the formidable nature of the problems that the future holds. But I would not have you believe on that account that I am a pessimist for the post-war period. We have heard much of Hitler's strength through joy movement, and we don't think much of that. But I am no advocate of a strength through misery movement. We can find our happiness in our own way by the dedication of our working lives to the cause for which we have taken up arms, the sanctity of the pledged word, and freedom and opportunity for our fellow men. . . .

The Times, May 9, 1942, p. 5, *Britain Plans*, p. 25.

Herbert Morrison, Secretary of Home Affairs and Home Security: Statement, May 12, 1942

. . . I believe that the way to permanent peace after the war is this: —

(1) Hit Germany and other Axis Powers hard and win a decisive victory. Liquidate the Nazis and Fascists if their own people do not.

(2) Take trouble in making a peace of world justice, and promote political and economic cooperation for the good of all peoples. Perpetuating grievances is not the way to perpetuate peace.

(3) Let the Allies police the world and impose peace until a new and effective organization is firmly established.

(4) Let this international organization not merely be a talking shop (though talking has its uses), but let it wield such decisive military and economic power as would enable it or its constituent peaceful nations to veto the very beginnings of warlike policies on the part of Germany or any other State with militarist traditions or tendencies.

Britain Plans, p. 25.

Viscount Cranborne, Secretary of State for Colonies: Statement to the House of Lords, in Answer to a Discussion on Post-War Policy towards Germany, May 21, 1942

. . . Whatever has been done in the past, there is one thing that is certain, the policy that was adopted after the last war is not the same policy as that which is outlined in the Atlantic Charter. The policy after the last war was calculated, if not altogether intended, to penalize Germany economically as well as militarily. Now, the conception of the Atlantic Charter is a completely different one. There is in it an absolute determination to prevent Germany or any other aggressive nation from achieving a position which would enable it to inflict such another catastrophe on the world. Those nations are to be disarmed and, as I understand it, kept disarmed. But there is no intention to discriminate against them permanently from the economic point of view. On the contrary, the Atlantic Charter specifically states that . . . so long as Germany behaves in a law-abiding manner — if she is capable of doing such a thing — she will be treated economically like all other nations. . . .

. . . I can give the House, an absolute assurance . . . that there is no question of any departure by His Majesty's Government from the policy of the Atlantic Charter, which remains the fundamental basis for the

policy of His Majesty's Government and of the United States and of the United Nations as a whole, who have adhered to that Charter.

Parl. Deb. Lords, vol. 122, 1187-8;
The Times, May 22, 1942, p. 8.

*Treaty of Alliance in the War against Hitlerite Germany and Her Associates in Europe and of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance Thereafter Concluded between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, London, May 26, 1942*¹

[Ratifications exchanged at Moscow, July 4, 1942]

His Majesty The King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, and the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Desiring to confirm the stipulations of the Agreement between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for joint action in the war against Germany, signed at Moscow on the 12th July, 1941,² and to replace them by a formal treaty;

Desiring to contribute after the war to the maintenance of peace and to the prevention of further aggression by Germany or the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe;

Desiring, moreover, to give expression to their intention to collaborate closely with one another as well as with the other United Nations at the peace settlement and during the ensuing period of reconstruction on the basis of the principles enunciated in the declaration made on the 14th August, 1941³ by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain to which the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has adhered;

Desiring, finally, to provide for mutual assistance in the event of an attack upon either High Contracting Party by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe;

Have decided to conclude a treaty for that purpose and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries: —

¹ For statement on the treaty by Mr. Eden see p. 238, and by Viscount Cranborne, p. 246.

² See p. 208.

³ See p. 2.

His Majesty The King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

The Right Honorable Anthony Eden, M.P., His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

The Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

M. Vyacheslav Mikhaïlovich Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,

Who, having communicated their Full Powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows: —

PART I

ARTICLE I. In virtue of the alliance established between the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the High Contracting Parties mutually undertake to afford one another military and other assistance and support of all kinds in the war against Germany and all those States which are associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe

ARTICLE II. The High Contracting Parties undertake not to enter into any negotiations with the Hitlerite Government or any other Government in Germany that does not clearly renounce all aggressive intentions, and not to negotiate or conclude except by mutual consent any armistice or peace treaty with Germany or any other State associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

PART II

ARTICLE III. (1) The High Contracting Parties declare their desire to unite with other like-minded States in adopting proposals for common action to preserve peace and resist aggression in the post-war period.

(2) Pending the adoption of such proposals, they will after the termination of hostilities take all the measures in their power to render impossible a repetition of aggression and violation of the peace by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

ARTICLE IV. Should one of the High Contracting Parties during the post-war period become involved in hostilities with Germany or any of the States mentioned in Article III (2) in consequence of an attack by that State against that Party, the other High Contracting Party will at

once give to the Contracting Party so involved in hostilities all the military and other support and assistance in his power

This Article shall remain in force until the High Contracting Parties, by mutual agreement, shall recognize that it is superseded by the adoption of the proposals contemplated in Article III (1) In default of the adoption of such proposals, it shall remain in force for a period of twenty years, and thereafter until terminated by either High Contracting Party, as provided in Article VIII.

ARTICLE V. The High Contracting Parties, having regard to the interests of the security of each of them, agree to work together in close and friendly collaboration after the re-establishment of peace for the organization of security and economic prosperity in Europe They will take into account the interests of the United Nations in these objects, and they will act in accordance with the two principles of not seeking territorial aggrandizement for themselves and of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

ARTICLE VI. The High Contracting Parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

ARTICLE VII. Each High Contracting Party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other High Contracting Party

ARTICLE VIII The present Treaty is subject to ratification in the shortest possible time and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged in Moscow as soon as possible.

It comes into force immediately on the exchange of the instruments of ratification and shall thereupon replace the Agreement between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, signed at Moscow on the 12th July, 1941.

Part I of the present Treaty shall remain in force until the reestablishment of peace between the High Contracting Parties and Germany and the Powers associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

Part II of the present Treaty shall remain in force for a period of twenty years. Thereafter, unless twelve months' notice has been given by either Party to terminate the Treaty at the end of the said period of twenty years, it shall continue in force until twelve months after either High Contracting Party shall have given notice to the other in writing of his intention to terminate it.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech Made on the Occasion of the Signature of the Treaty of Alliance between the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R., London, May 26, 1942

. . . Such then is the first chapter of our task, the overthrow of Hitler and the destruction of all that his regime stands for. But there is a second chapter also to our treaty. One day the war will end. One day the common enemy will be defeated and there will be peace again. We must see to it that this time the peace endures. In the treaty which we have signed we pledge ourselves to work together for this purpose.

Never before in the history of our two countries has our association been so close or our mutual pledge for the future so complete. This is surely a happy augury. There is nothing exclusive in our agreement. We are seeking peace and security not only for our two countries but for all the United Nations. But understanding between us is one of the foundations of peace not for us alone but for the world. We have signed our treaty and part of the work is behind us. . . .

U K., Cmd. 6368, Russia No 1 (1942); *B I.N.*, 1942, XIX, p. 565-7; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 254.

Viscount Cranborne, Secretary of State for the Colonies: Speech before the House of Lords, June 2, 1942

. . . His Majesty's Government regard themselves as absolutely pledged to carry out the Atlantic Charter — all the Articles of the Atlantic Charter . . .

We would, I suggest, do well in future to govern our conduct in the international sphere by the principles which apply in our own national life. I suppose we here in England are about the most law-abiding nation in the world. But we still maintain a large and efficient police force. We do this, not because we want to be able to quell disorder when it has arisen; we do it because we want to show that the forces of law and order are so strong that it is not worth while for lawless people to attempt to break the peace.

. . . We must apply the same principles in international affairs. For law-abiding nations to disarm their Army or their Navy because they have won the war is really just as foolish as it would be for a law-abiding community to disband its police force because it has quelled one riot. The forces of order — and this principle is incorporated in the Atlantic Charter itself — must be stronger than the forces of disorder if peace is to be preserved. Criminals, whether they be nations or whether they be individuals must be fully disarmed. . . . A time may come when all men will be naturally law-abiding, but that time certainly is not yet, and in

any settlement that we are going to reach at the end of this war we must take account of human imperfections. . . .

This question of peaceful change clearly presents, as I think has already been said, one of the most complex and difficult problems with which the world is likely to be faced. No nation, whether it is big or small, will willingly or easily submit to the derogation of its sovereignty, the sense of sovereignty is so deeply ingrained in us all. But we must face the fact, that the world will not stand still, and sooner or later changes will be inevitable. I know this problem is going to be very difficult, but unless we can devise some machinery for making changes peacefully, ultimately they will always be made by war. . . .

. . . Plans are being hammered out, . . . exchanges of view are already taking place, and . . . all the various aspects of the post-war problem are being considered with the Dominions, with the United States, with Russia, and with the other United Nations. . . .

. . . The greater part of Europe will emerge from the war denuded of stocks of food as well as of raw materials, and with few financial resources. Not only must food be provided in order to prevent starvation, but agriculture and industry must be revived, so that the peoples of each country may, as soon as possible, be able to support themselves. Unless steps can be taken rapidly to ensure supplies to the necessitous areas, a process of disintegration may set in which will create further dangers and political strain. Nor will this problem be confined to Europe. It may be equally necessary to provide relief for countries in the Near East and in the Far East. Steps will have to be taken on the basis of needs, and effective machinery for distribution will have to be organized. It is an immense problem and the planning of the arrangements for these purposes cannot be left to settlement when the war is ended.

Happily, there is today, both in the Government and outside, a general appreciation that immediate action must be taken to provide for post-war needs and to ensure that economic recovery will be restarted as soon as possible. I think His Majesty's Government can claim to have taken the lead in this matter. As your Lordships will be aware, as far back as August 1940, at the very lowest moment in the war, the Prime Minister pointed to the need for arranging in advance for the speedy entry of food into the enslaved areas of Europe when they had been cleared of German forces and had genuinely regained their freedom. Following on this declaration, His Majesty's Government took the initiative of convening a meeting of Allied Governments at St. James's Palace in September, 1941.¹ At this meeting, as your Lordships will

¹ See p. 3-4

remember, a resolution was proposed by the Foreign Secretary, setting out that it was the common aim of the Allied Governments to secure that supplies of food, raw materials, and articles of prime necessity should be made available for the post-war needs of the liberated countries.

. . . a small bureau, which for the time being consists of a few British officials, was set up to coordinate the estimates of requirements and present proposals to the Allied Governments. In accordance with this resolution the preparation of the estimates of requirements is going forward. The work is being undertaken by the representatives of the Allied Governments in London who are in daily touch with the officials of the bureau engaged in collating these estimates.

Various technical problems have arisen which are the subject of general discussion, and a committee on which agricultural experts sit under the Chairmanship of Sir John Russell, . . . is making the survey of post-war agricultural requirements such as the produce of the special qualities of seed required and the position of livestock, agricultural machinery and fertilizers. Experts from the United States as well as the Dominions are collaborating in this work. Estimates of requirements having been ascertained, the next step will be to organize the provision of supplies. It was expected that in many parts of the world there would be excessive production which could not be absorbed during the war and would be available for post-war requirements. That applied to such foodstuffs as wheat and maize and coffee and also the supplies of some raw materials, particularly cotton and wool which would also be adequate to meet all demands, so that it might be possible to organize the supply of some of the most important primary commodities. In the case of other commodities, however, the extension of the war to the Far East has resulted in available supplies being fully absorbed by the war requirements of the United Nations. Therefore, there is no longer a question of laying up stocks of these commodities and making them available, and arrangements will be needed to coordinate world production and allocate it according to need, as happens with all commodities with regard to which there is a shortage.

If the extension of the war has aggravated the problem of securing supplies, it has also brought about a new alliance of the free nations. The problem of post-war relief is no longer the concern merely of the Allied Nations. It is a world-wide problem which can be dealt with only by concerted action between the United Nations. His Majesty's Government are in close touch with the United States Government on this subject, for no policy and no program can be formulated in the near

future without such collaboration if it is to assure as far as is humanly possible that effective measures are organized to meet the events of the post-war world. . . .

The Atlantic Charter outlines the objective which the United Nations have set before themselves. To give practical effect to this objective, the fullest and frankest consultation between the United Nations is called for. . . .

In the immediate post-war period it is reasonable to expect that shortage of supplies and transport difficulties will continue, and measures to prevent inflation will be as necessary or even more necessary than during the continuance of the war. War-time measures, such as rationing and control and guidance of investments, must remain national needs and will necessarily continue for some time. Willingness to make sacrifices for the general good will be as important in the post-war period as in the war period. That I can assure your Lordships will be the spirit which will actuate His Majesty's Government and the Governments of the United Nations as a whole.

I would like now to say a word or two about what is being done on a rather different plane. Considerable progress is being made in the discussion of post-war problems under the auspices of the International Labor Organization. A meeting of the Emergency Committee of the Governing Body of the International Labor Organization was recently held in London.¹ The purpose of this meeting was to carry further the work begun by the New York Conference on post-war prosperity and reconstruction. The nature of the work which was to be carried out by the International Labor Organization was not closely defined by the Conference, nor was it indeed possible for the Conference to do more than indicate its general character. The part which the Organization can play will depend on the circumstances and the use which the Governments continue to make of it when the time comes. One of the main tasks was, therefore, to decide to what subject and in what way the International Labor Organization should take up certain economic studies which are necessary for the preparation of post-war planning and measures of long-term reconstruction. It is intended that this Committee should serve as a link between the Allied Governments and responsible agencies who are planning post-war reconstruction. Its main function will be to keep itself informed of financial and economic plans and to scrutinize them in relation to the International Labor Organization. The meeting of the Committee also provided arrangements for cooperation between the International Labor Organization and the Eco-

¹ See p. 7, n. 1.

nomic and International Department of the League of Nations and other international agencies. Preparations were made with regard to the program of studies of the International Labor Organization with special reference to public work policy, immigration and textiles. Perhaps it is hardly necessary to add that His Majesty's Government, as a member of the International Labor Organization, will continue to give it every assistance in their power.

I hope that I have said enough to show the House that steps are being taken on the official plane. But that is not all. Supplementary to these formal negotiations, there are informal contacts too, equally close exchanges of views, going on between His Majesty's Ministers here and Allied Ministers in London. The Foreign Secretary, in the normal course of his daily duties, is in close and regular touch with the Allied Foreign Ministers in London, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Financial Secretary of the Treasury are in constant touch with the Allied Finance Ministers. Opportunity is thus afforded for exchanges of views not only on current affairs but on the financial aspects of post-war reconstruction. Particular attention is being paid at the moment to problems which arise in connection with inflation and currency difficulties which will have to be faced when the occupied territories are freed from enemy domination. The President of the Board of Trade equally maintains touch with the Allies.

One medium of discussion is provided through the agency of a Subcommittee set up for the purpose of exploring the post-war needs of Southeastern Europe. In form, this is a Subcommittee of the Post-War Export Trade Committee, but in practice its scope is very wide, since discussion of post-war conditions in that part of the world involves questions of a fundamental kind. Such questions cannot indeed be answered adequately until there are more definite signs of what post-war conditions are to be and what commercial policy is to be followed. The Subcommittee's work should, however, contribute something to these very questions, since it involves a study of the means of raising the standard of life in Southeastern Europe and putting these countries in a prosperous and tranquil state. The method adopted by the Subcommittee is to hold a series of conferences, which are tentative and semi-official in character, without commitment to any particular policy on either side, with representatives of the countries concerned and with the people in this country who have made a study of the subject. This matter had also been discussed with members of the United States Administration visiting London, and an exchange of views has taken place on the scope of the problem. Finally, though I do not propose to go fully

into this, apart altogether from official and semi-official contacts, there are other contacts between the Allied experts here in London. These go on the whole time. They are blessed by His Majesty's Government and are of the greatest assistance, because we have been fortunate to have within our shores some of the greatest authorities on these many and difficult problems.

. . . We seek the closest cooperation with our Allies in Soviet Russia. Noble Lords will remember that during the visit of my right honorable friend the Foreign Secretary to Moscow last year he had exchanges of views with M. Stalin and members of the Soviet Government on questions of the post-war organization of peace and security. These exchanges of views have provided important and useful material for further elaboration of concrete proposals on this subject, and since that visit we have kept, and shall continue to keep, in close touch with a nation that is playing so very great a part in winning this war and has an equally large part to play in winning the peace. Finally, there is the great, ancient, and indomitable people of China. I suppose that never has the star of China shone as brightly as it shines today. Never has the world owed her so much. So aged in wisdom, so young in spirit, she has a great contribution to make to the future of humanity. We welcome her cooperation in the task of world settlement which lies before us. . . .

Parl Deb Lords, vol 123, 34-49.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Statement to House of Commons on the Treaty of Alliance with the U.S.S.R.,¹ June 11, 1942

. . . The Treaty provides that after the war our two countries will render each other mutual assistance against any further attack by Germany or her associates. It further provides that we will collaborate with one another and with the other United Nations and in the peace settlement and during the ensuing period of reconstruction on the basis of the principles set out in the Atlantic Charter. . . .

The United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. reaffirm their determination to afford one another all possible assistance in the war and "not to enter into any negotiations with the Hitlerite Government or any other Government in Germany which does not clearly renounce all aggressive intentions and not to negotiate or conclude except by mutual consent any armistice or peace treaty with Germany or any other State associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe."

The two countries also agree that they will, when peace is reestab-

¹ For text see p. 235.

lished, work together for the organization of security and economic prosperity in Europe. In doing so, they will take into account the interests of the United Nations, and they undertake to be guided by the two principles of not seeking territorial aggrandizement for themselves and of not interfering in the internal affairs of other States. The two Governments go on to declare their desire "to unite with other like-minded States in adopting proposals for common action to preserve peace and resist aggression in the post-war period." Meanwhile, when the war is ended they will take "all measures in their power to render impossible a repetition of aggression and violation of the peace by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe."

There is, of course, bound to be some interval after victory has been gained before an effective international system can be built up for preserving peace and for the prevention of further aggression. The two Governments accordingly have agreed that should one of our countries during the post-war period become involved in hostilities with Germany or any of her European associates in consequence of an attack by one of them, the two Governments will at once give each other "all military and other support and assistance" in their power. . . .

The signature of this treaty not only formulates and emphasizes the closeness of the collaboration between our two countries during the war. It affords also an indispensable basis for European reconstruction. This does not mean our two countries alone will be responsible for the peace of Europe when the war is won. That is a burden which will be shared by all the United Nations. It means that without the closest understanding between Great Britain and the Soviet Union there can be no security and stability in Europe, either for ourselves or any of our Allies.¹ The problems of peace, of course, are not for Europe alone, and I hope, with assured confidence, that the good work our two governments have accomplished will be welcomed by the President and people of the United States, and will enable our three great countries to work together in the years of peace as now in the hard times of war.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 380, 1351-6; *The Times*, June 12, 1942;
Vital Speeches, 1942, VIII, p. 561-2.

W. M. Macmillan, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies: Speech to the House of Commons, June 24, 1942

. . . The war has shown us certain inescapable facts, of which we will learn the lesson. Self-government without security means nothing.

¹ For statements by Allied leaders on Anglo-Soviet Treaty see *I-A R.*, 1942, II, p. 146-9.

Independence without defense is vain. The future of the world is in larger organizations and not in breaking up into a large number of small countries. It is in the light of these events that we should think of our future relationship with the Colonies as a permanent and not a transitory thing. The governing principle of the Colonial Empire should, therefore, be the principle of partnership between the various elements composing it. Out of partnership come understanding and friendship. Within the fabric of the Commonwealth lies the future of the Colonial territories. According to different needs and different conditions there will be the greatest divergence of local responsibility, but, however far these may be developed, there are broad Imperial problems which only admit of corporate resolution. Trade, currency and monetary questions, defense, transport by sea, land and air — all these are Imperial questions. Capital development itself, on which the future of the territories depends, must be thought of as a whole.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 380, 2017–18, *Britain Plans*, p. 32.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Broadcast, July 14, 1942¹

. . . For us the full restoration of France as a Great Power is not only a declared war aim and the fulfilment of a pledge made to a sister nation, but also a practical necessity if post-war reconstruction is to be undertaken within the framework of that traditional civilization which is our common heritage. . . .

On October 21, 1940, Mr. Churchill spoke these words to you: — “Je refuse de croire que l’âme de la France soit morte et que sa place parmi les grandes nations du monde puisse être perdue.” These words were spoken in France’s blackest hour, and Britain’s. The confidence he expressed then is shared today by all the United Nations.

July 14 is the day of France’s liberation from the tyrannies of the past. Today we celebrate it in the hope and certainty that her liberation from the tyrannies of the present will be accomplished. On the day of that liberation we know that we and the people of France will again be brothers in arms.

Meanwhile the people of Britain pray for that day and prepare themselves for it as ardently as you do. For we know that the people of France and the peoples of Britain and her allies stand side by side with a common purpose, animated by a common ideal.

The Times, July 15, 1942, p. 3.

¹ This message was printed in French and the leaflets dropped by airplanes over France.

Viscount Cranborne, Secretary of State for the Colonies: Speech to the House of Lords, July 21, 1942

... The Anglo-Soviet Treaty does not directly involve the Dominions; that is to say, it is a Treaty between the United Kingdom Government and the Soviet Government, and it does not bind the Dominion Governments. We all know, however, that they are vitally interested in it, and I should like to make it quite clear — and I am glad to have the opportunity of doing so — that the Dominion Governments were in fact consulted at every stage of the negotiations. It is quite evident, from statements which have been made by those Governments since the signature of the Treaty, that the Treaty had their full approval

.

... The question of a development of inter-Imperial machinery is not a matter for a unilateral declaration by one member of the British Commonwealth. The noble Viscount in his speech,¹ I think, said that there were three main bonds that united the Empire. The first was common allegiance to the Crown; the second was the bond of sentiment arising from a common kinship and language; and the third was freedom of thought, action and expression. I myself would add a fourth, the bond of mutual interest. Together the members of the British Commonwealth can have, I suppose, the greatest influence for good of any great Power in the world today. Their importance in the solution of the far-reaching problems of the post-war world, problems both political and economic, problems such as the problem of underconsumption, their importance for that purpose so long as they remain together cannot be overestimated; but if they once became separated into their component units, then they would find that all their influence was gone. They would be merely a number of comparatively unimportant States, without power and without authority. . . .

Parl. Deb. Lords, vol. 123, 961-70.

Sir William Jowitt, Paymaster General and Minister in Charge of Reconstruction Studies: Speech at Swansea, July 22, 1942

... We want collaboration between ourselves and the United States to go on after the war, but it must be collaboration which is in no sense exclusive between ourselves and from which all the United Nations may benefit. It is well that we should face the facts. . . .

¹ Viscount Elibank, U. K., *Parl. Deb. Lords*, vol. 123, 933-43.

In the future we must find a better way, and a more orderly way, a less extravagant way than cut-throat competition not only in internal but in external matters. . . .

We have much in common and we realize as they do that the future of the world rests on our continued collaboration with the United States. This does not mean that either nation is looking to an exclusive partnership. We do not believe in the ideal of a superior race or a world divided into half-slave, half-free. We shall welcome the help of all in working out an order that will indeed be new and not a revival of the worst features of the ancient world. We both want each and every nation of the world to work out its own destiny in peace, in freedom, without want and without fear.

In the absence of this world-collaboration before the war, trade was becoming more and more restricted, more and more subjected to hard bargaining between individual nations, resulting in bilateral treaties, barter agreements, blocked currencies and the like, all tending more and more to curtail trade and impoverish the world. With so many nations in financial straits after this war there will be a great temptation to go back to this state of affairs and even to intensify it. This must at all costs be avoided, but it can only be avoided if the more prosperous nations take a generous line, helping the others to stand once more upon their feet and to collaborate in a new system which will safeguard the world against this happening again. I say a "generous" line, but in reality it will prove to be the line of self-interest in the end. It would not be in our interests to go back to pre-war system of trading; it would not be in the interests of the United States, and it would certainly not be in the interests of the world as a whole.

Thanks to science and machines, the world today produces her fruits in due season and produces sufficient for everyone. There is no reason why any individual in this world should not have an adequate standard of living. The problem is a problem of exchange and distribution. The higher the standard of living becomes throughout the world the greater the demand for goods and services will be and the better able will people be to pay for the goods and services they require. Our aim must therefore be to raise the standard of living throughout the world and as a first step to raise the nutritional standard throughout the world.

Buying in the cheapest market is not necessarily always the wisest course. We must have regard to the interests of the primary producer as well. No stable system can be evolved unless the primary producer, producing under circumstances of economic efficiency, is able to get a fair return for that which he produces. Nor can industry be properly

planned and full employment maintained if the prices of the primary commodities are allowed to rocket about as they did before the war. I did not mean that it is practicable or desirable to fix prices which, like the law of the Medes and Persians, cannot be altered. You cannot for long go on fighting against long-term trends, and generally speaking it would be against the interests of mankind to try to do so. Some new method of production may arise, some new discovery may be made. Some new country more economically suited may start production. The price of that commodity is bound to fall, but I do say that the short-term alterations in prices which have been such a feature of recent years, which are not infrequently due to the operation of speculators, should be ironed out by international control. . . .

Britain Plans, p. 34.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech at Albert Hall, Nottingham, July 23, 1942

We must have no illusion about the future, even after the war is won. To win the peace will be as hard a task as to win the war. We will need the same national unity at home. We will need something of the same spirit of self-denial and sacrifice. We will need true friendship between the nations who have fought as Allies if we are to win through. We are pledged to play our full part in building a peaceful, active international society.

It is therefore most encouraging to note that in the United States the President himself and a number of leading statesmen have repeatedly expressed their determination to work for a world in which each country shall be given the opportunity to develop its own life and its own resources to the benefit of all. In this task, our American friends can be sure we are ready to meet and work with them all the time, all the way.

After the war, the problem of peace will be urgent. We lost the last peace because the nations failed to work for it with the same energy they displayed in the war. We do not dare to make the same mistakes nor take the same risks with Germany again. Disarmament of the aggressor powers must be complete.

But, then, the first task must be to feed the starving populations. As you may have read, certain steps already taken provide for this event. For instance, in a wheat agreement concluded between the United States, Canada, Australia, the Argentine and Great Britain, a plan has been agreed upon to store and distribute wheat fairly so that the inter-

ests of farmers in the producing countries and of the consumers shall both be protected during the interim of the reconstruction period.¹ This agreement also provides for a more permanent arrangement to include other countries when once they are free and able to voice their own needs. This is only a small part of the problem of the revival of international trade.

There is also the problem of enabling devastated, impoverished and economically undeveloped countries to restart their industry and agriculture, for, until people produce, they cannot purchase what they need. This involves the type of relationship which should exist between highly developed powerful countries and those that have not attained the same level of economic activity or have little experience in self-government.

I feel there are two principles which should govern these relations, not only because they are just principles, but also because they are in accord with the best interests of all.

First, the receipt of financial and economic aid must not result in the loss of independence for any country. Secondly, any form of assistance or guidance given to a country unpracticed in the art of self-government must be such as to help it achieve its own development.

There are many complicated and difficult matters to be worked out after the war. They will require not only hard work and much good will, but also political invention of the highest order. When new political relationships develop, novel forms of political instruments, or working arrangements, are required to give expression to them.

Sometimes political instruments have been evolved slowly over centuries. Such has been the experience of the British form of government. On other occasions a new political instrument has been invented in one stroke, as, for instance, the American Constitution.

After the last war, the British people invented a new political instrument in the shape of "Dominion Status" which gave expression to the relations between the peoples of the British Commonwealth. Another political instrument was invented by President Roosevelt recently when he devised the plan of Lend-Lease.

The future of the world will depend on our skill in foreseeing and creating the necessary political machinery after the war. Whole empires have been made or lost by their success or failure to adapt themselves to changing times.

The United Nations are working together for victory. Not before have independent nations cooperated so closely and effectively for a common end. The purpose for which they are fighting is that each and

¹ For text see United Nations, p. 13.

every country shall be able to develop and improve its own life in peace.

This is a task which will call forth all energies at home.

Never again must we tolerate chronic unemployment, extremes of wealth and poverty, slums and the lack of opportunity for so many which disfigured our national life in the past. It will take years of hard work before we have remade our country to our liking, although the Government has already begun to lay the plans for the future, both at home and in the international sphere. Together with the United States, the Soviet Union, China and other nations, we shall take our part in working for the development of a great, world-wide civilization.

For this great work in international relations to thrive, it must be founded on a moral basis. We are fortunate in having special opportunities to found it on that good neighbor policy and to be able to begin it now at home. To set against the hatred this war has engendered, our small country has been able to make many friendships. As a youthful English poet wrote with juvenile insularity when fretting in Berlin: "For England's the one land I know where men with splendid hearts may go."

Since 1939 it has been our good fortune to welcome men with splendid hearts from different countries. Friendships we have been proud to make have proved we can be good neighbors and good comrades. Now, with the arrival of American armed forces in large numbers in this country, we are entering a new essay in friendship.

I am ambitious that the Americans should establish a consciousness of a comradeship in war that will abide in the peace to come. Its growth will be warmed by stories of heroism like those of the fifteen American torpedo bombers, none of which returned. They pursued and attacked, unprotected, the Japanese navy in the recent victory off Midway Island, where vengeance was taken for Pearl Harbor.

But the comradeship I have in mind cannot be rooted only in the fighting of a common foe, still less in speechmaking. It will endure only if the Americans and we find that we care for the same fundamental things — liberty, decency, self-respect and opportunity for the common man — and that we care for them a lot.

The most important question I now see in the sphere of foreign relationships is how American soldiers and airmen will be made happy in our British setting. The future Anglo-American friendship now for the first time in history is in the hands of the people of this country. Knowing the great-heartedness and the generosity of our people, I look forward with confidence to the outcome of this great experiment. I pray

that out of the accident of war may come the lasting benefit of peace.¹

Bulletins from Britain, 1942, No. 101, p. 9-10.

Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord Privy Seal: Speech to the British Association for the Advancement of Science, July 25, 1942

. . . A great mass of research and investigation is under way both in Government circles and amongst non-official bodies and individuals . . . But beyond these technical investigations there is another aspect of this problem which must never be lost sight of.

We may make the most careful plans, work out the most detailed methods, call in the help of scientists, economists and politicians, but all this will be of no avail unless there is in the peoples of all nations a determination to succeed, a spirit of cooperation and a ruthless insistence that we should make the common good of humanity the overriding inspiration of our policies. We are fighting for a moral and not merely a material issue. Though our plans must be scientifically prepared there must be behind them the inspiration of our most deeply religious convictions. The magnitude of our task calls for the utmost of our idealism.

If we were to drop back into the old competitive struggle between nations or between corporations in the attempt to win national monopolies for world resources, then no planning could succeed. Rival plans would be formulated and the more elaborate they were the greater and more destructive would be the rivalry between them. One thing is sure, that the United Nations must, at the end of the war, undertake international regulation of the production and distribution of essential raw materials, both in the interests of the immediate rehabilitation of the devastated countries as well as with a view to attaining that steadily rising standard of living throughout the world which is one of our objectives. It is too early as yet to lay down finally the form that such a regulative system should take. This is one of the matters which requires exploration and which must be worked out by common agreement amongst the United Nations. . . .

For the purpose of war we have built up a great store of knowledge and of practice which we must be prepared to use for the winning of the peace. We must turn our machinery of economic warfare into one of economic welfare. When I speak of "we" I am not referring to the British people alone. The whole essence of our action in this field must be cooperation with others both in development and in use. . . .

¹ Mr. Eden's speech and that of Mr. Hull on the same day gave rise to a discussion in the House of Lords, August 5, 1942 (*Parl. Deb. Lords*, vol. 124, 196-237).

It is perhaps necessary to say a word as to the difficulty which arises in the minds of some people as to the interrelation of such an international policy to our own purely national interests. Beyond doubt our first duty as Britishers is to our own people so to organize our economy and our resources as to give them a decent and happy standard of life; to provide them with a good and equal education and to see that none are overpressed in making their individual contribution to our production effort. In a world economy where there was a shortage of natural resources this duty to our own people might compel us to some extent to enter into competition for those natural resources with the peoples of other nations. But the gift of science to the world is that it has shown the way to attain an economy of plenty: it has discovered where the natural wealth of the world is to be found and how it may be transformed into those things which the people need for their living.

That knowledge is not the monopoly of any single country for it has been made available to all the world. There is therefore now no necessity for competition on a world of scarcity to win a decent standard of livelihood for our people. If we make our full contribution to the productive resources of the world, and other countries do the same, there can be enough for all. Two wars have already proved to us what organization and planning can do to increase our capacity to produce. They have provided a demonstration and a proof of the possibility of plenty which the free peoples of the world must never forget.

Perhaps the most revolutionary element in our war experience is this revelation of an almost unlimited capacity for production in the mutually destructive effort of war and the growing realization that this great productive capacity can equally be organized for the purposes of peace, if only we are so prepared to plan our economy as to make it available.

Neither we nor any other nation must attempt to erect ourselves — as Hitler is striving to do with Germany — into a privileged people living upon the labor and the efforts of other — as he would call them — subhuman peoples. . . .

We must frankly admit that in the past we have not succeeded in achieving a wise use of our resources and that therefore we shall need new methods and new organizations if the principles of the Atlantic Charter are to become a reality and not remain, as have so many good resolutions in the past, nothing but pious aspirations.

The road upon which we must make this advance we have to some extent already plotted, and indeed we have actually proceeded along it in developing the plans of the United Nations for their war effort. It is

nothing less than the subordination of private and national interests to the public and international good. . . .

Britain Plans, p. 37.

*Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Statement to the House of Commons, in Response to a Question Concerning the Establishment of an International Court of Justice*¹ after the War, July 29, 1942

His Majesty's Government are entirely in favor of the establishment, or re-establishment, after the war of an International Court of Justice, and have noted with much interest the references to this subject made by Mr. Cordell Hull² in the course of his speech on July 23. . . . As I have made plain on previous occasions, it is the view of His Majesty's Government that international authority after this war will require to be backed by international force. In this respect also, we are in entire agreement with the United States Secretary of State.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 382, 478.

*Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Letter to Jan Masaryk, Czechoslovak Minister of Foreign Affairs, Denouncing the Munich Agreement, August 5, 1942*³

.

. . . The Prime Minister had already stated in his message broadcast to the Czechoslovak people on September 30, 1940, the attitude of His Majesty's Government in regard to the arrangements reached at Munich in 1938. Mr. Churchill then said that the Munich Agreement had been destroyed by the Germans. This statement was formally communicated to Dr. Beneš on November 11, 1940. The foregoing statement and the formal act of recognition have guided the policy of His Majesty's Government in regard to Czechoslovakia, but in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding I desire to declare on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, that as Germany has deliberately destroyed the arrangements, concerning Czechoslovakia, reached in 1938 in which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom participated, His Majesty's Government regard themselves as free from any engagements in this respect. At the final settlement of Czechoslovak

¹ For another comment on the same subject see speech by Viscount Simon, p. 254

² See section United States, p. 105.

³ See also Mr. Eden's statement to House of Commons, August 5, 1942 (*The Times*, August 6, 1942, p. 3, 8).

frontiers to be reached at the end of the war, they will not be influenced by any changes effected in and since 1938.

U. K., Cmd. 6379 (1942), Czechoslovakia.

Viscount Simon, The Lord Chancellor: Speech to the House of Lords, August 5, 1942

. . . The Atlantic Charter and the Anglo-Soviet Treaty are of course international documents; and, while that certainly does not absolve either the Government or the Legislature or the people of this country from trying to form concrete resolutions about the topic, it does make it excessively dangerous to advance, without prearrangement, explanations and propositions that perhaps might be challenged. . . .

. . . I think it will probably be a general feeling — that these two documents, the Atlantic Charter and the Anglo-Soviet Agreement, belong to that small class of documents which have the penetration and the power which partake of the nature of positive, masterly action. Whenever a collection of international documents is made in the future, going right back to the beginnings of time, I doubt very much whether there will be any document which is recognized as having the possibilities of more permanent influence and importance than the Atlantic Charter and the Anglo-Soviet Agreement.

.

. . . Mr. Cordell Hull ¹ in that speech pointed out that the Atlantic Charter does not propose to substitute international authority for sovereign rights and self-government. The conception is that sovereign rights and self-government will be preserved and made, as far as self-government is concerned, more authoritative and complete. The aim is not to impose, by a kind of reverse Diktat, international authority on the world after the war. The conception is not that we should aim at forcing upon as many people as possible the dictates of some international organ, but rather that we should aim at getting agreement between as many sovereign communities as may be, each of them, we trust, enjoying rights of self-government, so that as the result of consent, not as the result of externally applied force, this international authority is able to speak in the name of all well-disposed people. . . .

. . . I would like to say just a word about the functions and the conception of an international court of justice . . . what you have to aim at is not one thing but two. One is the international court of justice, and the other is the international force, power, influence, which will, in case

¹ See section United States, p. 99.

of need, bring about a better world. An "international court of justice" and an "international agency to keep the peace" are not really one thing; they are really two things. I do not think that any real benefit can be done to the cause of peace in the future by exaggerating the range that can be covered by an international court. It is very important to realize what it can do, but it is also very important to realize what it cannot do.

. . . A court of justice, whether it is a municipal court or an international court, is not charged with the duty of altering people's rights and awarding things to people who have not got them. It exists for the purpose of interpreting and applying impartially agreements which have been made, or the principles which lie behind the Common Law; and so in the case of an international court. An international court may perfectly well be asked — was asked after the Treaty of St. Germain — whether the *Anschluss* with Austria was consistent with the treaty of peace, or inconsistent with it.¹ That is a legal question which it could decide. An international tribunal of the days long ago, at the time of the Alabama dispute, could be set up for the purpose of determining whether we ought to pay compensation for breach of International Law in connection with that particular unfortunate episode. But you cannot appeal to judges as judges for the purpose of determining what changes ought to be made in territory or the like.

.

. . . Many matters of dispute, many causes of controversy in the world, are not necessarily settled to the general satisfaction merely by telling people what their existing rights are. A just judgment does not necessarily lead, even in the municipal sphere, to contentment all round, and the Permanent Court of International Justice necessarily confines itself to deciding things that are susceptible of judicial treatment. I think myself, being a warm partisan of the whole conception of international justice, it would be most unwise to treat a court, however independent, as specially qualified to solve what are really political problems. Nothing is more likely to bring the whole scheme of a permanent court into disrepute than the suspicion that distinguished jurists who sit on it concern themselves with anything except impartial judgment on the basis of the law as they find it. That is the fundamental reason, in my view . . . why you do not get the whole way by talking about international

¹ *Customs Regime between Germany and Austria* (Protocol of March 19, 1931). Permanent Court of International Justice, Series A/B No. 41, New York, Columbia University Press.

arbitration or an international court. You want an instrument which Mr. Cordell Hull and the Atlantic Charter calls an international authority whose duty it would be to keep the peace by the use, if need be, of force to repress the aggressor, and which would have wide enough functions to try to adjust from time to time these disputes that arise between nations and neighbors. . . .

Parl. Deb. Lords, vol. 124, 224-34.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Report to the House of Commons on His Visits to Egypt and Moscow and Survey after Three Years of War, London, September 8, 1942

.

When the hour of liberation strikes in Europe, as strike it will, it will also be the hour of retribution. I wish most particularly to identify the British Government and Commons with the solemn words which have been lately used by the President of the United States,¹ namely, that those who are guilty of the Nazi crimes will have to stand up before tribunals in every land where their atrocities have been committed, in order that an indelible warning may be given to future ages and that successive generations of men may say "So perish all who do the like again."

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 383, 97, summary in *B.I.N.*, 1942, XIX, p. 835.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Statement on Austria to House of Commons, September 9, 1942

The policy of His Majesty's Government towards Austria was stated by my honorable friend the Prime Minister at the Mansion House on 9th November, 1940,² when he said that Austria is one of the countries for whom we have drawn the sword and for whom our victory will supply liberation. While His Majesty's Government cannot, of course, commit themselves at this stage to recognize or support the establishment in the future of any particular frontiers in Central Europe, I must make it plain that His Majesty's Government equally do not regard themselves as being bound by any change effected in Austria in and since 1938.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 383, 123-4.

¹ See p. 109.

² See p. 193.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech at Leamington, September 26, 1942

... Some months ago I felt it my duty to describe to the House of Commons some of the bestial crimes committed in Hong Kong. Similar crimes had been committed four years earlier in Nanking. We in this country only read about these dark happenings, but our Allies in Europe and Asia have long been suffering them in their very homes.

Every day new crimes are added to the list. We are resolved that they shall not go unpunished. We are not animated by a spirit of revenge, natural though such a spirit must be to so many in Europe today, but by the conviction that civilized justice will only be restored to its rightful place in the affairs of men when the criminals who have sought to destroy it are made to answer for their deeds. Retribution must be swift, sure, complete.

I have spoken of the conditions of the people in the enslaved lands. How do we propose to help them once the ever-increasing might of the Allied Forces begins to assert itself? The enemy must first be expelled by the Allied armies root and branch from the countries he has occupied and befouled. Law and order must be re-established, civil administration set going, communications repaired and the essential services of civilized life restored.

This work must inevitably in the initial stages be carried out under military supervision, since the Allied armies could not operate satisfactorily unless the essential needs of the distressed populations behind their lines were secured. But as operations proceed and conditions in the liberated countries begin to settle down, there must obviously be a progressive transfer of responsibility to the civil administration, particularly the responsibility of maintaining security and feeding the population.

Hence the change over from military operations to what I would call the second stage of "Relief" will take place almost insensibly and the second stage may well be under way in some of the territories while in others the military stage will continue. Much will, of course, depend on the speed with which effective free Governments can be organized, but in the Allied countries this should not take long.

The object of "Relief" will be to ensure that so soon as the territories are clear of the enemy the population will no longer suffer privations. The task of organizing relief should be simplified by the existing war organizations for the distribution of supplies.

For instance, the Anglo-American "Combined Boards," which have

now been established for allocating food, raw materials and shipping, will, even though they may not after the war continue in exactly the same form, provide useful models and a wealth of practical experience. But this is, of course, not all.

A year ago the representatives of the Allied Governments met at St. James's Palace under my presidency and passed a resolution recording their common aim to secure that supplies of food, raw materials and articles of prime necessity should be available for post-war needs of the countries liberated from Nazi aggression.¹

It was further resolved that the plans of the Allied Governments should be coordinated, that estimates of requirements should be prepared and priorities indicated and that plans for the most efficient employment of Allied shipping resources after the war should be worked out.

It was also agreed that an Inter-Allied Committee should be set up in London under British presidency, and this Committee has been actively working on the program of requirements.

The entry of America into the war obviously called for a fresh examination of the whole problem and a number of discussions have taken place with the United States authorities. I myself have had preliminary conversation on the subject with the Soviet Ambassador, and the Chinese Government have also been approached regarding relief in the Far Eastern area.

It is obvious that all the United Nations must play their part in any scheme of relief and that this cannot be arranged in a moment of time. It is therefore right to get ready now. The work of preparation is going forward and the United Nations between them must find both the will and the physical means to cope with the immediate problems of distress in areas freed from Axis oppression.

There are great problems to be faced. But those members of the United Nations who have fallen victims to Axis aggression may be confident that their more fortunate companions, together with their own legitimate governments, are determined to surmount them.

At any rate, so far as this country is concerned, I feel sure that the British people as a whole will willingly submit to a considerable sacrifice in order to relieve distress among their Allies on the continent of Europe.

But what of the future? What of the post-war world which we have to create? How are we to set up an international order more in harmony with the natural trends of our civilization and more likely to give rise

¹ See p. 4.

to a long period of real peace than the machine-made and soulless tyranny of the *Herrenvolk*?

The answers to these questions lie in the cooperation of the United Nations and more especially, within the United Nations, on the cooperation of the great powers.

Taking it by and large over the whole course of our history, we firmly maintain and shall not cease to repeat that our influence has been a good one, and has resulted in keeping the peace and in expanding the population in vast areas which would otherwise undoubtedly have been subjected to catastrophic wars.

In particular we are determined to keep in close step with the United States in all matters of policy and we have also specifically pledged ourselves by the Anglo-Soviet Treaty to collaborate fully in post-war reconstruction with Soviet Russia.

China, too, whose heroic resistance has roused the admiration of the Western world, is clearly a fourth partner in this scheme of things. Indeed it stands to reason that unless we do collaborate fully with these great peoples the chances of building up enduring security against the ever-present menace of a revival of Nazi and Japanese aggression will be small.

Such cooperation therefore must be the foundation of the post-war world. But on this foundation there should be a superstructure. The smaller States, I am glad to say, are also alive to the need for collaboration among themselves. There is the Polish-Czech agreement¹ and the Greek-Yugoslav agreement,² both of which call for and indeed express a sense of unity. So far as we are concerned we shall continue to foster agreements of this kind and to encourage the smaller States to weld themselves into larger, though not exclusive groupings. Thus they will be better able in collaboration with the great powers to play their part in maintaining the peace.

So I come to the conclusion of the matter, which is this. An enduring settlement and a better world after the war cannot be created unless they are based on understanding, confidence, and will. Will to see realities and to face them. The old world is dead; it was dying even before it was broken in pieces by the hammers of Wotan and Thor.

None of us can now escape from revolutionary changes even if we would. But so far as we are concerned, there is only one safe way through the maze of post-war complications. That is a belief in ourselves as a

¹ See p. 464.

² See p. 535.

nation and a belief in our duties and responsibilities as a World Power and to the world at large. If we are inspired with this sense of mission, cooperation with our Allies, great and small, will be all the easier. . . .

I-A.R., II, p. 255-7.

Viscount Simon, Lord Chancellor: Statement on Punishment of War Criminals to the House of Lords, October 7, 1942

. . . If, this time, there is going to be, after the victory of the United Nations, due punishment of these abominable war crimes, perpetrated in breach of the laws of war by enemy nationals and for which enemy individuals must be held responsible, it would be a grave mistake to concern ourselves at this stage merely with the discussion of the most appropriate tribunal to deal with such charges, or with the minutiae of juridical analysis. Whatever the tribunal may be, there are two prerequisites without which no tribunal for dealing with war crimes can effectively act, and these two conditions will not be satisfied unless definite steps are taken to that end. What are they? The one is the recording of evidence, and the other is securing the presence of the accused at the trial. We can all discuss these fine points about the right Court until the crack of doom, but, unless the criminal tribunal has got those two conditions satisfied, it cannot exercise its powers. No criminal tribunal can effectively exercise its powers unless it has physically before it the person charged — because this is a criminal proceeding — and unless there is available for it in some form the proof which is alleged to establish the crime. Of course I entirely agree with my noble friend Lord Cecil that, though feelings are naturally deeply stirred here, we have the most solemn duty to hold strictly by the rule that people shall only be punished because they are proved to be guilty. . . .

Now these two matters . . . raise questions which for some time past have been occupying the attention of His Majesty's Government and which, after being closely studied have been the subject of communication with others of the United Nations; . . . I am now in a position to make on behalf of His Majesty's Government an announcement on both those points. And it will be seen from what I am about to say that the view we take is not the view of ourselves alone.

Firstly, then, as to the collection of the necessary evidence. The proposal is to set up with the least possible delay a United Nations Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes. The Commission will be composed of nationals of the United Nations, selected by their Gov-

ernments. The Commission will investigate war crimes committed against nationals of the United Nations recording the testimony available, and the Commission will report from time to time to the Governments of those nations cases in which such crimes appear to have been committed, naming and identifying wherever possible the persons responsible. The Commission should direct its attention in particular to organized atrocities. Atrocities perpetrated by or on the orders of Germany in Occupied France should be included. The investigation should cover war crimes of offenders irrespective of rank, and the aim will be to collect material, supported wherever possible by depositions or by other documents, to establish such crimes, especially where they are systematically perpetrated, and to name and identify those responsible for their perpetration.

. . . A corresponding statement as to this proposed Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes is being issued in Washington by the President of the United States this afternoon ¹ This proposal, therefore, has the joint support of the Government of the United States and of His Majesty's Government, and it has been communicated to the other United Nations directly concerned, including, of course, our Soviet and Chinese Allies, the Dominions and India, and the Fighting French, with a view to obtaining their concurrence and cooperation, and already we have received from the Allied Governments established in London and from the French National Committee replies warmly approving and adopting this proposal

The ambit and purpose of the United Nations Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes — that is to be its title — will be clear from what I have already said, but to avoid any misunderstanding and to take away any possible excuse for misrepresentation in enemy quarters, His Majesty's Government wish to add this — and a statement to the same effect is, I understand, being issued at this moment in Washington by the United States Government. In making this proposal for an investigating commission the aim is not to promote the execution of enemy nationals wholesale; the aim is the punishment of individuals, obviously very few in number in relation to the total enemy population — individuals who are proved to be themselves responsible, whether as ring-leaders or as actual perpetrators, for atrocities — atrocities which violate every tenet of humanity and have involved the murder of thousands, of tens of thousands, of innocent persons.

¹ See section United States, p 114

Our object . . . is not to undertake or encourage mass executions but to fix these horrible crimes upon those enemy individuals who are really responsible and who ought to be dealt with as criminals in respect of them. . . . I am persuaded that it is only by the carrying out with complete impartiality of some such system as this that we could contribute to prevent what would otherwise be still further massacres of still more people, many of them innocent, who certainly will not have received a fair and orderly trial.

I now turn to the second topic of importance to which I referred — namely, steps for the production of persons accused. It is a most difficult question to which a great deal of attention has been given, to my knowledge, not only by official bodies, but also by very important and well-instructed committees. To obtain the surrender of the culprits — how is that to be secured? . . . The Treaty of Versailles failed to secure the effective punishment of the principal criminals, partly owing to the fact that provision for this purpose was only contained in the final Treaty of Peace, negotiated and signed months and months after the Armistice in June 1919. What my noble friend Lord Cecil has told us of his recollection of what went before is a warning, and certainly justifies the insistence that more than one of your Lordships have expressed that things should not be left to run until we come to the end of the fighting. We do not intend to make the same mistake as was made by postponing this demand until the final treaty of peace has been signed. Named criminals wanted for war crimes should be caught and handed over at the time of, and as a condition of, the Armistice, with the right to require the delivery of others as soon as the supplementary investigations are complete.

This proposal is also one which is welcomed by our European Allies established in London and by the Fighting French who have all associated themselves with it. We are, of course, also in communication with Soviet Russia and China on the point as well as with the Dominions and India, who are further away, but we are still awaiting replies. I would emphasize that this last provision which I have mentioned is one to which our European Allies now established in London attach extreme importance. When one reflects on the horrible story of cruelty and outrage from which their homelands and fellow-citizens have suffered, and are suffering still, one can well understand the reason for their determination.

Such are the two proposals supported by the Government of the United States and by our European Allies which I have named and which I now put before the House. They are definite steps, to be taken with a

serious purpose. They will, of course, require a great deal of elaboration and working out. Some of the technical matters mentioned in the debate today require also the closest attention, and all this must be done not by ourselves alone, but in cooperation with our Allies. I am sure we should pursue resolutely this course, difficult as the way may be. The proposal contemplates post-war action in a region where there are very few precedents to guide us, but we will act in the spirit of the declaration, quoted by Lord Maugham,¹ made not long ago by the Prime Minister himself when he said that, henceforth, among the major purposes of the war must be included the exaction of retribution for the cold-blooded execution of innocent people. The Prime Minister added on that occasion that the atrocities in Poland, in Yugoslavia, in Norway, in Holland, in Belgium, in Greece, and above all, perhaps, behind the German lines in Russia, surpassed anything known since the darkest and most bestial ages of mankind.

U. K., *Parl. Deb. Lords*, vol. 124, 580-1.

British Foreign Office: Statement on Extraterritoriality Rights in China, London, October 10, 1942

His Majesty's Government have declared in public pronouncements on the 14th of January, 1939, the 18th of July, 1940, and the 11th of June, 1941, that they were prepared at the conclusion of hostilities in the Far East to negotiate with the Chinese Government for the abrogation of the extraterritorial rights and privileges hitherto enjoyed by their nationals in China. Similar pronouncements have been made by the United States Government,¹ with whom His Majesty's Government have been in consultation.

In order to emphasize their friendship and solidarity with their Chinese Allies, His Majesty's Government have now decided to proceed further in this matter at once. Accordingly, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs made a communication to the Chinese Chargé d'Affaires in London on the 9th of October indicating that His Majesty's Government hoped in the near future to open discussions with the Chinese Government and to present for their consideration a draft treaty for the immediate relinquishment of extraterritorial rights and privileges in China and for the settlement of questions intimately connected therewith.

His Majesty's Government have recently been engaged in an exchange

¹ See U. K., *Parl. Deb. Lords*, vol. 124, 555-67

of views with the United States Government on this question. They have been pleased to learn that a similar communication¹ was made by the United States Government on the same day to the Chinese Ambassador in Washington and the fact that the two Governments have found it possible to take similar action in this important matter has occasioned lively satisfaction in London.

British Information Services, N. Y.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Address Made at Dinner for the Lord Mayor after the Landing of American and British Troops in North Africa, London, November 10, 1942

. . . You have, no doubt, read the declaration of President Roosevelt, solemnly endorsed by His Majesty's Government of the strict respect which will be paid to the rights and interests of Spain and Portugal,² both by America and Great Britain.

To those countries, our only policy is that they shall be independent and free, prosperous and at peace. Britain and the United States will do all that we can to enrich the economic life of the Iberian Peninsula. The Spaniards, especially, with all their troubles, require and deserve peace and recuperation. . . .

For ourselves we have no wish but to see France free and strong, with her empire gathered round her and with Alsace-Lorraine restored. We covet no French possession. We have no acquisitive designs or ambitions in North Africa or any other part of the world. We have not entered this war for profit or expansion but only for honor and to do our duty in defending the right.

Let me, however, make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter: we mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. For that task, if ever it were prescribed, some one else would have to be found, and under a democracy I suppose the nation would have to be consulted.

I am proud to be a member of that vast commonwealth and society of nations and communities gathered in and around the ancient British monarchy, without which the good cause might well have perished from the face of the earth.

Here we are and here we stand, a veritable rock of salvation in this drifting world. There was a time not long ago when for a whole year we stood all alone. Those days, thank God, have gone.

¹ See section United States, p. 120.

² *D. S. Bul.*, VII, p. 905-7.

We now move forward in a great and gallant company. For our record we have nothing to fear. We have no need to make excuses or apologies. Our record pleads for us and we shall get gratitude in the breasts of every man and woman in every part of the world.

As I have said, in this war we have no territorial aims. We desire no commercial favors, we wish to alter no sovereignty or frontier for our own benefit.

We have come into North Africa shoulder to shoulder with our American friends and allies for one purpose and one purpose only. Namely, to gain a vantage ground from which to open a new front against Hitler and Hitlerism, to cleanse the shores of Africa from the stain of Nazi and Fascist tyranny, to open the Mediterranean to Allied sea power and air power, and thus effect the liberation of the peoples of Europe from the pit of misery into which they have been passed by their own improvidence and by the brutal violence of the enemy.

These two African undertakings, in the east and in the west, were part of a single strategic and political conception which we had labored long to bring to fruition and about which we are now justified in entertaining good and reasonable confidence. Taken together they were a grand design, vast in its scope, honorable in its motive and noble in its aim.

British and American forces continue to prosper in the Mediterranean. The whole event will be a new bond between the English-speaking people and a new hope for the whole world. . . .

The Times, November 11, 1942; *Vital Speeches*, IX, 1942, p. 66-7.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Broadcast, London, November 29, 1942

. . . facing the facts — the ugly facts, as well as the encouraging facts — undaunted, then we shall learn to use victory as a spur to further efforts and make good fortune the means of gaining more.

This much only will I say about the future, and I say it with an acute consciousness of the fallibility of my own judgment. It may well be that the war in Europe will come to an end before the war in Asia. The Atlantic may be calm while in the Pacific the hurricane rises to its full pitch.

If it once should take such a course we should at once bring all our forces to the other side of the world to the aid of the United States, to the aid of China and above all to the aid of our kith and kin in Australia and New Zealand in their valiant struggle against the aggressions of Japan.

While we were thus engaged in the Far East we could be sitting with the United States and with our ally Russia, and those of the United Nations themselves shaping the international instruments and national settlements which must be devised if the free life of Europe is ever to rise again and if the fearful quarrels which have rent European civilization are to be prevented from once more disturbing the progress of the world.

It seems to me that should the war end thus, in two successive stages, there will be a far higher sense of comradeship around the council table than existed among the victors at Versailles. Then the danger had passed away, the common bond between the Allies had snapped. There was no sense of corporate responsibility such as exists when victorious nations who are masters of one vast scene are, most of them, still waging war side by side in another.

I should hope therefore that we shall be able to make better solutions of the problems in Europe at the end of this war than was possible a quarter of a century ago.

It is not much use pursuing these speculations farther at this time, for no one can possibly know what the state of Europe or of the world will be when the Nazi and Fascist tyrannies have been finally broken.

The dawn of 1943 will soon loom red before us and we must brace ourselves to cope with the trials and problems of what must be a stern and terrible year.

We do so with the assurance of our growing strength, and we do so as a nation with a strong will, a bold heart and a good conscience.

The Times, November 30, 1942; *Vital Speeches*, IX, 1942, p. 134.

Sir William Jowett,¹ Paymaster-General and Minister in Charge of Reconstruction Studies: Speech to the House of Commons during Debate on Reconstruction, December 1, 1942

. . . The more prosperous other nations are the more prosperous we shall be ourselves. We must aim deliberately at improving the standard of living not only in this country but throughout the world in order that consumers abroad may be able to buy that which we produce. We must pursue an expansionist policy. It will not be enough for industrialists to follow the methods of their fathers or their grandfathers. Industry

¹ Sir William Jowett is chairman of a Ministerial Committee "to organize and co-ordinate the work of reconstruction which is being carried out by various Departments of State." (*Ibid*, 1084; see also speech by Viscount Cranborne in the House of Lords, December 9, 1942, *Parl. Deb. Lords*, vol 125, 497-508.)

must be on its toes; it must show the same energy and activity as our armies in North Africa.

But, given freedom from fear of aggression, I suggest to the House, and I am not being unrealistic, that the prospects of an increased standard of living throughout the world are almost unlimited. Think of Russia being able, assuming you get a satisfactory system against aggression, to devote to the services of peace all those vast energies she has had to devote to the service of war. Think of China, waking from her long sleep, and, under her great leader, looking forward to years of peace, order and good government. Think of India, with the leaders of India settling among themselves and for themselves their great political problems and being able to pay attention to improving economic conditions. Think, too, of our Colonial peoples — and surely the last word in Dominion trade has not been said.

The misuse of science has got us into this trouble, and the right use of science has got to get us out of it. I believe we must become as a nation more scientifically-minded, prepared, whatever industrial system we may adopt, to adopt scientific methods and to aim at the greatest efficiency in those methods.

. . . The problem which I have been putting to the right hon. Gentleman who began the discussion does not concern ourselves alone. It plainly concerns the whole British Commonwealth of Nations. It concerns that group which we have come to know as the United Nations. Indeed, it concerns the whole world, but in the first place the idea of the United Nations holds out the greatest hope for the construction of a system for the future. Collaborating in peace — as we have already collaborated in war — to banish the possibility of aggression, and then in a world freed from the fear of aggression to build up, by joint action, a higher standard of living through the world, is the task which the United Nations should undertake. We have signed the pacts to which the right hon. Gentleman referred — the Atlantic Charter, the Mutual Aid Agreement and the rest — and they point the way, but they have to be worked out in far greater detail.

We have given much preliminary thought and work to these matters, and we are ready, and indeed are anxious, to press on with these discussions with our Allies. We are confident that, given good will on all sides, these discussions will lead to international collaboration of a kind which will carry the United Nations over the grave difficulties of the years immediately following the war and will lay the foundations of a new era of international trade. That is what we hope, and to that we are prepared to make our contribution. It is a great satisfaction to us

to know that the International Labor Office, which has developed since the last war, has not only maintained itself but has functioned with great efficiency during this war. In working out schemes for raising international standards, His Majesty's Government will continue to collaborate with that organization. . . .

. . . Now I shall turn to . . . the problem of the Occupied Countries. Many countries have been occupied, and I believe that, on the whole, the occupation has been more ruthless and more brutal than any occupation recorded in history. . . . Not only Christian principles but elementary principles of common sense make it incumbent upon us to do all we can to put these things right and to do it at once.

More than a year ago, an inter-Allied Committee was set up in London to work out plans for European post-war relief. The preparation by the Allied Governments of their estimates of requirements is now well advanced. Since that Committee was set up, the war has extended to the Far East, and the relief problem now becomes a world-wide problem and not merely a European problem. Discussions have been initiated with the United States Government, which is represented on the London Committee, as well as with the Dominion Governments, and there is general agreement that the United Nations must be fully ready to meet the problem, when the time comes, as the first step in the restoration of economic conditions after the war. Consultations are now proceeding as to the best method of achieving that common purpose. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 385, 1082-83, 1085-86.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the House of Commons, during Debate on Reconstruction, December 2, 1942

. . . The moment the armistice is signed and hostilities are over there will be a desire to let up, a desire to cut our responsibilities, and yet whether we are able to maintain peace or not afterwards will depend on whether we can carry through this cooperation which we have now established with other great powers, in particular with the United States of America, with Soviet Russia and with China. . . .

. . . There will be an immense temptation for everybody to relax and to say, "Everything is over," and naturally we shall feel infinitely more cheerful; but in passing over into the period of Armistice and peace we must sustain the effort we are making now. We have got to do it or we shall find we have lost the greater part of what we have been fighting for.

I have spoken of four great powers, ourselves, Russia, the United States of America and China, but I must make it plain that I do not visualize a world in which those four powers try to clamp down some form of big-power dictatorship over everybody else. What will happen when the fighting is over is that these great powers, and particularly ourselves, the United States and Russia, will have a virtual monopoly of armed strength, and that armed strength must be used in the name of the United Nations to prevent a repetition of aggression. But other powers, be they great, be they small, provided they are willing to play their part, will, I trust, be secured in the enjoyment of that independence for which they have fought and suffered so long. Indeed, it is essential that the independence of these other countries should be restored if we are to create a free international society in Europe. And so I say that in any world system that is to operate all States will have to play their part.

Now I should like to say a few words about our own position in all this. . . . Our foreign policy is to a large extent dictated by our geographical position. Whether we like it or not, we are part of Europe. Whether we like it or not, we are also the center of a great Imperial Commonwealth, and so we are, in that sense, a world power too.

. . . Our duty is to act as a bridge, and there is nobody who can play that part but us — nobody else. It is to us that the nations of Europe will look, and I believe are looking now, for a message as to our attitude after the war. . . .

. . . I would like our answer to be, "Whatever we can do to help you to re-establish your ruined economies we will do. The first need of Europe will be to build up an enduring system of defense against the possibility of renewed German aggression. We are prepared to make our contribution to that system and we are prepared to do this because we understand full well that peace and security in Europe are part of our own peace and security; and never again shall we turn our backs on Europe." That, I hope, is our message to Europe. . . .

. . . Our general object is to form a world system for ensuring the peaceful development of all peoples; but there is an essential preliminary to all this which we must never forget. It is to restrict, let us hope for all time, the aggressive power of Germany and Japan. I make no mention of Italy, because I do not regard that as a major problem. . . . During the last 70 years — these are unpleasant historical facts which we have to face — successive German Governments have consciously and consistently pursued a policy of world domination. This policy and the philosophy that is behind it is the first threat to enduring peace, and it

270 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

will be the first and imperative duty of the United Nations on the morrow of their victory to elaborate such a settlement as will make it impossible for Germany again to dominate her neighbors by force of arms. That lies at the root of the business, and it would be sheer folly to allow some non-Nazi German Government to be set up, and then, so to speak, to trust to luck. The rooting out of the old false gods will be a long and strenuous business, but it must be accomplished. . . .

. . . Some Members may want to know what machinery I visualize. There are certain international services which have gone on during the war which have not died, and which may render great service after the war. There are the international health services and economic services and the work done by the International Labor Organization. We shall need that work more than ever after the war. The I.L.O. has struggled manfully, and with considerable success, to remove certain of the evils which are among the root causes of war: low standards of living, insecurity, and unemployment. Unless we can cure those evils, no peace structure can be enduring. The I.L.O. must be strengthened and developed. I should like to see it become the main instrument giving effect to Article 5 of the Atlantic Charter. Somebody may say, "How is all this to be done? What is the machinery to give effect to it?" I would reply that, although the machinery is important, it is, unfortunately, less important than certain other ingredients which are essential to the maintenance of peace. The Old League of Nations failed, not because its machinery was faulty but because there was not the representation or the force or the drive behind it.

To my mind, there are three indispensable attributes . . . for any international organization if it is to have a chance to achieve its purpose. First, it must be fully representative of the powers that mean to keep the peace. The old League was not. Second, the powers themselves must have the unity and the determination to arrive at agreed and positive decisions. And the third and perhaps the most important of all, is that they should have the force behind them to give effect to their decision.

Let us take heed a little from the lessons of the past, and let us try to learn them. I believe that out of this organization of the United Nations, based in the first instance on understanding between ourselves, the United States and Russia, a great opportunity opens to us. After the last war there was, quite naturally, a sudden reaction against militarism in all its forms and hatred of war . . . with the result that nations were reluctant to contemplate the use of force even to keep the peace. After this war we must, in my submission, be ready to make our military

contribution to the United Nations to enable them to keep the peace. I repeat, the task is going to be a heavy one, but there is an opportunity — a great opportunity . . . however great the effort, we have to make our cooperation in peace as true and as effective as it now is in these war years. There has never been a more skilful and complete cooperation than the cooperation in North Africa. Are we really to admit we can only achieve this in battle? It is inconceivable. It can be done, and it must be done. Please God, we do not forget these lessons in the years that lie ahead.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 385, 1253–60.

*Viscount Cranborne, Lord Privy Seal:*¹ *Speech to the House of Lords during Debate on Colonial Policy,*² *December 3, 1942*

. . . I said the other day in this House that the British Empire is not static but dynamic. That I believe to be profoundly true. The process of development which I have tried to describe has no fixed limits. It is a continuing process. There is no so far and no further in our policy. We have seen how the old Colonies in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa have grown into great self-governing nations, on an absolute equality with Great Britain and responsible for their own affairs, but linked to her by the enduring bond of loyalty to the Crown. . . I see the territories of the Colonial Empire moving along the same road, not perhaps in their present isolation but more closely associated in wider groups, playing an ever-growing part in the British Commonwealth of free nations. That is a noble conception which will, I hope and believe, in the fulness of time be realized. . . .

. . . The British Empire is not a chessboard composed of a number of squares of equal size and form and differing only in the fact that some

¹ Until November 23, Viscount Cranborne was Secretary of State for the Colonies.

² For further official statements on colonial policy see the statement of recommendations (Cmd 6174) presented to Parliament by the West India Royal Commission (which was appointed in August 1938 and submitted its report to the Government on December 21, 1939), and the *Statement of Policy on Colonial Development and Welfare* (Cmd 6175) presented to Parliament in February 1940. On May 7, 1940, the Colonial Development and Welfare Act was introduced in the House of Commons and was passed and promulgated on July 17, 1940. A circular despatch of June 5, 1941, by Lord Lloyd, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, to Colonial Governors, was presented to Parliament in August 1941 as a White Paper, *Certain Aspects of Colonial Policy in War-Time*, Cmd 6299.

In a statement of policy in the House of Lords on July 9, 1941, Lord Moyne (Lord Lloyd's successor at the Colonial Office) announced that a small committee had been set up at the Colonial Office under Lord Hailey to prepare the ground for the decisions which would be needed to plan colonial economies in the post-war world.

See speech of Col. Oliver Stanley, Secretary of State for Colonies, to House of Commons on colonial policy, December 21, 1942 (*Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 386).

are black and others white. It is a conglomeration of territories of infinite variety, of races, religions, history, and traditions. Some of these territories are immense, some of them are mere rocky islets in the ocean. Some have advanced and ancient institutions, some are amongst the most primitive that the world can show. All are different from the others, and each has to be treated separately. . . .

. . . But this can be said — and I would repeat it — all the British Colonies at the present time are moving in the right direction. In some cases progress is rapid; in some it is inevitably slow, and to attempt to go too fast would upset existing institutions before the population was ready for others. Of one thing I am sure — the British Colonial Empire is not coming to an end. The work that we have to do is only beginning. We, the citizens of the British Empire, whatever our race, religion, or color, have a mission to perform, and it is a mission that is essential to the welfare of the world. It is to ensure the survival of the way of life for which the United Nations are fighting, a way of life based on freedom, tolerance, justice, and mutual understanding, in harmony with the principles of the Atlantic Charter. In that great mission we must not, and we shall not, fail.

Parl. Deb. Lords, vol. 125, 415–17.

Viscount Cranborne, Lord Privy Seal: Speech to House of Lords, Following upon a Motion by Lord Strabolgi concerning the Immediate Relief of Peoples of the Countries Freed from Nazi Control, December 9, 1942

. . . It must be borne in mind that the organization of relief on any adequate scale is a vast undertaking. The war and the enemy occupation have ravaged some of the most densely populated and prosperous areas of the globe. If these countries are to be restored to prosperity within any reasonable period, steps must be taken beforehand to avert famine and the even greater risk of pestilences that are bred of malnutrition, and to provide the immediate measures of assistance needed to secure the rebuilding of social and economic life.

Action after the war for this purpose is not to be defended merely on humanitarian grounds. None of us can restore our own prosperity if our neighbors are going to be ruined. Nor is this all. It is, I think, a vital element in our war effort. The stubborn and unflinching resistance of the peoples in all the occupied territories will play no small part in the final overthrow of the brutal Nazi regime, to which they are at present subjected. These people must be assured that the United Nations have an effective alternative to the Hitler New Order, that the liberation of

their territories will bring an end to the bitter years of want and suffering, and that the tools and supplies will be provided wherewith they can rebuild their former prosperity and in time to carry it still further. We all owe an undying debt of gratitude to these peoples and we must see that their faith in the cause of the United Nations is not disappointed. The attainment of this aim must inevitably call for close and sustained cooperation between all the United Nations and a general readiness to make sacrifices for the common good ¹

Parl. Deb. Lords, vol. 125.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the House of Commons, Referring to the Declaration on the Extermination of the Jewish People in Europe,² December 17, 1942

... The hon. Gentleman and the House will understand that the declaration I have just read is an international declaration agreed to by all the Governments I mentioned at the outset. So far as the responsibility is concerned, I would certainly say it is the intention that all persons who can properly be held responsible for these crimes, whether they are the ringleaders or the actual perpetrators of the outrages, should be treated alike, and brought to book. ...

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 385, 2084.

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Statement on Albania in the House of Commons, December 17, 1942³

His Majesty's Government sympathizes with the fate of the Albanians, a people among the earliest victims of Fascist aggression. They wish to see Albania freed from the Italian yoke and restored to her independence. The form of regime and government to be introduced into Albania will be a matter for the Albanian people themselves to decide at the end of the war. What I have said does not in any way prejudge the question

¹ Replying to a question as to the necessity for some measure of rationing control after the cessation of hostilities, Viscount Cranborne referred the House to the statement he had made in the House in June 1942 (see p. 238).

Viscount Cranborne continued: "I do not wish to alter or modify one word of what I said on the previous occasion. There is a general expectation — an expectation that is shared by the Government — that some form of control must continue for a certain period after the war, and it is on that basis that plans are at present being made."

² For text see p. 14.

³ For comment on this statement by the Greek Prime Minister, see section Greece, p. 546.

of Albania's position in relation to such future arrangements as may be reached between the various Balkan states His Majesty's Government regards the question of the frontiers of the Albanian state after the war as a question which will have to be considered at the peace settlement.

British Information Services, New York.

***Herbert Morrison, Home Secretary and Minister of Home Security:
Speech at Swindon, December 20, 1942***

Our people have the right to be well-fed and shod and housed and schooled. They have the right to achieve those things for themselves and enjoy a sense of constructive usefulness in doing so Not all their jobs can be inherently attractive, but all can be done with a sense of worthwhile purpose as our jobs, whether dull or exciting in themselves, are done in wartime. Our economic life must be organized directly to achieve the object of a right standard of public well-being.

That means turning our backs forever on schemes of restriction whether of goods or of labor. If, tempted by any short-term argument, we ever again dabble in such schemes, in that instant our national future is threatened and our scheme of social security becomes a burden instead of a benefit, a load on our shoulders instead of a weight off our minds.

Never again dare we on any grounds, whether economic or moral, be indifferent if our productive machine is standing idle or running down or if the energies of the people are unused or under-used. It will be suicidal after the war for financial authorities and governments to stand by while great industries are more than half idle and great areas of the country are in distress. We shall be unable to afford such folly . . .

This end will not be realized in a day It will take discipline and patient struggle. But achieved it must and will be. In my view, to ensure a full national output and a proper welfare standard for all, much of the social control of production which we have learned to accept and value during the war will need to be continued during the peace.

Do not misunderstand this word "control." We have not adopted wartime public control for control's sake or only to keep naughty producers in order. We have adopted it because of the paramount need to put the interest of the whole community first, and because it is the best way of getting the most of what we want. People used to talk as though control were a cramping, limiting thing. It is not. Wise social control is a stimulating and enlarging thing.

I myself can see no sharp distinction in nature between the economic

problems of war and the problems of the strenuous and difficult peace which lies before us. If control is right and useful today, nobody can assume that it will be wrong and dangerous tomorrow. Remember that enterprise does not have to be private in order to be enterprise. In the nineteenth century it might have been true to contrast the vigor and freshness of private enterprise with the restrictive effect of public regulations. In the twentieth century, with the inevitable trend towards the centralized organization of big industry, private control has often tended toward the slowing-down of men's hands and minds, while many of the most remarkable examples of enterprise which the world can show have been public, from Britain's electricity grid to America's T.V.A [Tennessee Valley Authority] and Russia's Dnieper dam.

Social control of production, however, may take many different forms. How much we want and in what forms, cannot be settled in the terms of any political dogma. The sole test must be whether public interest is served by such measures in particular cases or not.

Some forms of economic activity would, like postal and telegraphic communications, respond well to ownership and management by a department of state. But a public concern in form is certainly not a universal panacea. Rather is it likely to be exceptional. What, for instance, should we do with our natural monopolies, and industries which cannot be carried on properly at all except on a monopoly basis? It may be that, instead of leaving them in private hands, tied down and hedged about by a tangle of statutory restrictions or bureaucratic checks, we should get better national service from them if they were turned into public corporations like the Central Electricity Board, the London Transport Board or, in another sphere, the B.B.C. [British Broadcasting Corporation].

Again, what should be done with industries which are not natural monopolies, but have, by growth and development in modern conditions, come nearer and nearer to being monopolies in fact through the operation of mergings and trade agreements, or cartels, like the iron and steel or chemical industries. These are the great basic industries on which the national well-being in peace, and safety in war, directly depend.

We can't leave them alone in monopolistic glory. We don't want to turn Britain into a corporative state and adopt Fascism in economic forms. The answer may be anything from a public corporation to some form of management under a board of directors with a nationally nominated chairman. The thing that matters is to secure in these large-scale basic industries a due measure of public guidance and public accountability, and these are not things which can be left to chance.

Then there are kinds of business where individual enterprise has a lot of value even in modern conditions — small business and some kinds of medium and small-scale manufacture. Here the answer may be that the community will best serve itself by standing aside, apart from insisting upon proper business practice and standard minimum pay and conditions for employees of all grades.

There will be a substantial place, too, as now, for the cooperative movement in trade and also, I believe, for cooperative enterprise in agricultural production and marketing. Farmers may find the answer to many of their problems and the means of preserving much of what is best in wartime arrangements by schemes of mutual aid on a systematic basis.

After the war, we shall, as a community, have to set about making the best living we can. We shall have to approach all economic problems on the basis that the interest of the community comes first. We should, I believe, have an annual economic and industrial budget as we now have an annual financial budget. We shall need each year a statement of cost, not merely of the government social services and the armed forces, but also of the national needs for wages and salaries, new capital outlay and capital repairs and renewals.

We shall, in fact, have to estimate the size not merely, as we do now, of the state budget, but of the national income as a whole and relate it to the demands we want to make upon it. If it falls short, we shall have to find ways of increasing it, or else we shall have to reduce our demands on it and decide where in the national interest cuts must be made.

After the war, a successful government will need a basis of public statistics much more extensive and far-reaching in kind than anything we possess today. No longer must we be in any doubt about whether we can afford this form of social security or that. The enlargement of government activity on such questions must not be left to the conjectures of partisans with an axe to grind. They must be matters much more of ascertainable fact than they were before the war.

And now I come back to my starting point. To adopt sound measures of law and administration is not enough; our public policy as a whole will not be sound unless it is founded firmly upon a clear appreciation of values other than material ones.

The efficient organization of industry is right, but it is not enough. Social security, too, can be abused at both ends of the economic scale. Poor people may learn to depend upon public schemes of welfare without developing a corresponding sense of duty to the community. Richer people may equally defraud communities of their productive labor force

by enjoying their incomes, without feeling or discharging their corresponding obligation.

We must be humane and understanding in our approach to such questions, but we must not be soft or sentimental. We want better standards than the old Victorian code of doing the best one can for oneself. We need to love our neighbors as ourselves, not merely in the sanctity of the home or in our circle of friends, but in the practical workaday world of business.

And while one cannot enforce the golden rule by a process of law, one can build an economic society in which it is easier to be unselfish, and much less profitable to be selfish, than in the world in which you and I grew up.

British Information Services, New York.

King George VI: Christmas Speech, Broadcast to the British Commonwealth, December 25, 1942

.

. . . though its outward observances may be limited, the message of Christmas remains eternal and unchanged. It is a message of thankfulness and of hope, of thankfulness to the Almighty for His great mercies, of hope for the return to this earth of peace and good will

.

This year it adds to our happiness that we are sharing it with so many of our comrades in arms from the United States of America. We welcome them in our homes, and their sojourn here will not only be a happy memory for us, but also, I hope, a basis of enduring understanding between our two peoples.

.

Many of you to whom I am speaking are far away overseas. You realize at first hand the importance and meaning of those outposts of Empire which the wisdom of our forefathers selected and which your faithfulness will defend. For there was danger that we should lose much and this has opened our eyes to the value of what we might have lost. . . . Wherever you are serving in our wide, free Commonwealth of Nations you will always feel at home. Though severed by the long sea miles of distance, you are still in the family circle whose ties, precious in peaceful years, have been knit even closer by danger.

.

.

The suffering and hardships shared together have given us a new understanding of each other's problems. The lessons learned during the past forty tremendous months behind us have taught us how to work together for victory. And we must see to it that we keep together after the war to build a worthier future.

.

So let us brace and prepare ourselves for the days which lie ahead. Victory will bring us even greater world responsibilities, and we must not be found unequal to a task in the discharge of which we shall draw on the storehouse of our experience and tradition. Our European Allies, their sovereigns, heads and governments, whom we are glad to welcome here in their distress, count on our aid to help them to return to their native lands and to rebuild the structure of a free and glorious Europe. On sea, on land, in the air and in civil life at home, a pattern of effort and mutual service is being traced which may guide those who design the picture of our future society . . .

.

So let us welcome the future in a spirit of brotherhood, and thus make a world in which, please God, all may dwell together in Justice and in Peace.

The United Nations Review, III, 1, p. 25.

ANNEX

BRITISH DECLARATIONS REGARDING INDIA

It is recognized that British policy toward India has developed independently of the war and that statements of the British Government regarding the future of India do not, strictly speaking, relate to its war and peace aims. Nevertheless, the fact that the question of the future treatment of dependent peoples has received so much attention in the discussion of war and peace aims, taken together with the immediate military need of enlisting the full support of the Indian people in the war effort, would seem to justify the inclusion of this section. For fuller documentation of the Cripps Mission, see *Documents on American Foreign Relations*, IV, p. 558-73.

India is approaching self-government as the result of a series of statutes and revisions extending over a quarter of a century. During World War I, India was associated with the self-governing Dominions in the Imperial War Conference and it became an original member of the League of Nations. In 1920, the Government of India Act granted a degree of self-government but less than had been hoped for by Indian nationalist leaders. In 1921, fiscal autonomy was granted. In 1929, Dominion status was designated as the goal of India's development. In 1935, a more advanced Government of India Act was passed providing for a federal union of British India and the Indian States. The part

of this Act referring to provincial governments went into effect in 1937, and most subjects formerly reserved to the Governor were put in the hands of Indian ministers. In the central government certain powers were still reserved to the Viceroy and Governor-General and his appointed Council of 7 members, 3 of whom were Indians. The outbreak of World War II caused postponement of the negotiations to bring the Government of India Act into full effect.

1939

- Sept 3 India became automatically a belligerent with the British declaration of war on Germany. The Viceroy issued a declaration announcing the fact.
- " 11 Viceroy announced that plans for completion of federation would be postponed until after the war.
- Oct. 17 White Paper issued¹ proposing establishment of a consultative group representing all parties to work with the Viceroy during the war and granting of Dominion status after the war.
- Nov. 15 Congress Party ministries in 8 Provinces² resigned in protest at the suspension of further constitutional reform until after the war.

1940

- Aug. 8 New declaration of British policy including announcement that a future constitution should be framed primarily on the responsibility of the Indians themselves and again proposing enlargement of Executive Council. No party accepted the offer. Limited civil disobedience instituted by Congress Party.

1941

- Jul. 22 Executive Council enlarged to 12, of whom 8 were Indians. A National Defense Council of 31 members, 22 from British India (20 of them Indians) and the rest from Indian States, was set up as an advisory body to make suggestions on the war effort. An Indian member of the Executive Council was appointed to Washington as Agent General. Non-cooperation continued.

1942

- Mar 22 Sir Stafford Cripps reached India with new British plan, published March 29, proposing an Indian constitutional convention at end of the war and guaranteeing acceptance of the constitution there drafted subject to specified reservations on minorities. The British Government was to retain control of India's defense during the war but the Indian Government was to organize general resources. The appointment of a representative Indian to the War Cabinet and to the Pacific Council was invited. The proposal was ultimately rejected by the Congress and Moslem parties.
- Jul. 2 Appointment of two Indian leaders to British War Cabinet. An Indian representative has also taken a place on the Pacific Council. The Viceroy's Council has been enlarged from 12 to 15 members. The Council now contains 11 Indians and 4 Europeans
- Aug. 8 The Congress Party Committee endorsed a resolution demanding Britain's withdrawal from India under threat of instituting non-violent mass opposition. The British Government rejected the demand and arrested Congress Party leaders
- Dec. 8 Lord Linlithgow's term of office extended to October 1943.

¹ U K., Cmd. 6121.

² British India is divided into 11 provinces.

King George VI: Message to India, London, September 12, 1939

In these days when the whole of civilization is threatened the widespread attachment of India to the cause in which we have taken up arms has been a source of deep satisfaction to me. I also value most highly the many generous offers of assistance made to me by the Princes and peoples of India.

I am confident that in the struggle upon which I and my peoples have now entered, we can count on sympathy and support from every quarter of the Indian continent in the face of the common danger.

Britain is fighting for no selfish ends, but for the maintenance of a principle vital to the future of mankind — the principle that the relations between civilized States must be regulated, not by force, but by reason and law, so that men may live free from the terror of war, to pursue the happiness and the well-being which should be the destiny of mankind.

The Times, September 12, 1939, p. 5.

Lord Linlithgow, Viceroy and Governor-General: Statement, New Delhi, October 17, 1939

Let me turn now to the question of India's future and of the lines of her constitutional development. That is a question, I am certain in the light of my conversations, which is of the greatest and most acute interest to all parties and all sections of opinion in this country. As matters stand today, the constitutional position of India and the policy of His Majesty's Government are governed by the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1935. Part III of that Act, which provides for the conferment of provincial autonomy on the Provinces of British India, has been implemented. . . .

The second stage contemplated by the Act was the reconstitution of the Central Government on such a basis as to achieve the essential goal of Indian unity. The method contemplated for that purpose was the achievement of a federation of all India, in which the representatives of all political parties in British India would, together with the Rulers of the Indian States, form a unified Government of India as a whole. . . .

Such being the background against which we are working, what are the intentions and aims of His Majesty's Government in relation to India? I cannot do better in reply to that question than to refer to the statement made on behalf of His Majesty's Government, and with their full authority, by the late Secretary of State for India in the House of

Commons on the 6th February, 1935 That statement makes the position clear beyond a shadow of doubt. It refers to the pledge given in the Preamble of the Act of 1919, and it makes it clear that it was no part of the plan of His Majesty's Government to repeal that pledge It confirms equally the interpretation placed in 1929 by Lord Irwin, as Viceroy, again on the authority of the Government of the day, on that Preamble, that "the natural issue of India's progress as there contemplated is the attainment of Dominion Status " I need not dilate on the words of that statement. They are clear and positive. They are enshrined in the Parliamentary record. They stand as a definite and categorical exposition of the policy of His Majesty's Government today and of their intentions today in this end, the future constitutional development and the position of India I would add only that the Instrument of Instructions issued to me as Governor-General by His Majesty the King-Emperor in May 1937 lays upon me as Governor-General a direction so to exercise the trust which His Majesty has reposed in me "that the partnership between India and the United Kingdom within our Empire may be furthered to the end that India may attain its due place among our Dominions."

That is the policy and that is the position Those are the intentions of His Majesty's Government. Let me go on to say another word about the Act of 1935 That Act was based on the greatest measure of common agreement which it was possible to obtain at the time when it was framed It was based, as is well known to all of us, on the common labors of British and Indian statesmen, and of representatives of British India as well as of the Indian States, over a long period of years . . .

I have I trust . . . made clear that the intention and anxiety of His Majesty's Government is, as stated in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor-General, to further the partnership between India and the United Kingdom within the Empire to the end that India may attain her due place amongst the great Dominions. The scheme of government embodied in the Act of 1935 was designed as an essential stage in that process. But I have made clear in what I have just said that His Majesty's Government will, at the end of the war, be prepared to regard the scheme of the Act as open to modification in the light of Indian views; and I would make it clear, too, that it will be their object, as at all times in the past it has been, to spare no pains to further agreement by any means in their power in the hope of contributing to the ordered and harmonious progress of India towards her goal. Let me in

that connection add that in the conversations I have had, representatives of the minorities have urged most strongly on me the necessity of a clear assurance that full weight should be given to their views and to their interests in any modifications that may be contemplated. On that I need say no more than that, over more than a decade, at the three Round Table Conferences, and Joint Select Committee, His Majesty's Government consulted with and had the assistance and advice of representatives of all parties and all interests in this country. It is unthinkable that we should now proceed to plan afresh, or to modify in any respect, any important part of India's future Constitution without again taking counsel with those who have in the recent past been so closely associated in a like task with His Majesty's Government and with Parliament.

.
India and the War, Cmd. 6121 (1939), p. 5-7.

Lord Linlithgow, Viceroy and Governor-General: Announcement, New Delhi, November 6, 1939

.

. . . It was in the light of profound consideration and long discussion that, on 18th October, I made a declaration on behalf of His Majesty's Government. That declaration emphasized, firstly, that Dominion status remained the goal for India; secondly, that His Majesty's Government were prepared to reconsider the scheme of the present Act at the end of the war, in consultation with leaders of opinion in India; thirdly, that His Majesty's Government attached importance to associating public opinion in India with the prosecution of the war and that, for that purpose, they contemplated the formation of a consultative group, the details of which were to be settled after I had further consulted with party leaders.

The announcements in my statement are of great importance. Their importance has been belittled but they represent points of real substance. The debates in Parliament which followed the publication of my statement brought out another important point — the readiness of His Majesty's Government, if certain conditions were secured, to associate Indian opinion in a still closer and more responsible manner with the conduct of the war, by a temporary expansion of the Governor-General's Executive Council.¹ But the reception in British India, both of my declaration and of the subsequent debates in Parliament, was, so far as the Congress was concerned, definitely hostile. . . .

¹ The debates took place on October 26, 1939 (*Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 352, 1622-1714).

I next invited Mr Gandhi, Dr Rajendra Prasad, and Mr Jinnah to come and see me on 1st November, and I discussed the whole position with them frankly. I had already in my previous conversations discussed with them, as with almost all my visitors, from various aspects the possibility of an expansion of the Governor-General's Council. .

The discussions [among themselves] which I suggested have taken place. The result to me has been a profound disappointment. There remains today entire disagreement between the representatives of the major parties on fundamental issues. All I must say now is that I am not prepared to accept this failure. I propose in due course to try again in consultation with the leaders of these great parties and the Princes to see if even now there may still be the possibility of securing unity.

During all the time I have been in India there is nothing I have been more anxious to secure than unity. And unity matters far more to India than is perhaps always realized. Unity too, means that Indians, whatever their community or whatever their party allegiance, and whether they dwell in British India or in Indian States, must work together in a common scheme. It is worth a great deal to try to bring that about . . .

We are dealing with a problem that has defeated the united endeavors of the greatest organizations in this country. There are grave differences of view which have to be taken into account, and which should be bridged. There are strong and deeply-rooted interests which are entitled to the fullest consideration and whose attitude is not a thing lightly to be brushed aside. There are minorities which are great in numbers as well as great in historic importance, and in culture. Those are all factors to which full weight has to be given. But complex as the problems are, I refuse to regard them as insoluble, and I prefer to believe that, like other human problems, they will yield to patient discussion in a spirit of good will. In this belief I am encouraged by the friendly feeling which has pervaded my discussions with leaders of parties¹. . .

India and the War, Cmd. 6129 (1939), p. 4-6.

Leopold C. M. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India: Report of Broadcast, London, June 15, 1940

Referring to brutal aggression against many nations in the last few years and weeks, Mr Amery said that against the dangers the nations of the British Commonwealth could look to a partnership, free yet

¹ For further developments see *India and the War*, Cmd. 6196 (1940).

assured, to sustain their mutual welfare in peace and defend their liberties in war. By their free action they were showing today the price they set upon that partnership. In their case full equality, full partnership, had already been achieved. In the case of India we had made manifest our sincere desire that she should, as a willing partner, attain to the same status in the British Commonwealth as was enjoyed by the Dominions, or, for that matter, by ourselves. . . .

The Times, June 17, 1940, p. 3.

Lord Linlithgow, Viceroy and Governor-General: Broadcast, Simla, June 19, 1940

The withdrawal of France from the fight, if it is confirmed, does not in the least degree affect the settled determination of His Majesty's Government to continue the struggle to defeat the enemy and to achieve the ideals for which they are fighting. Except by the defeat of the enemy there is no hope of the achievement of these ideals, no hope for the survival of modern civilization, for the protection of which we have been prepared to make sacrifices. I am confident that the people of India will wholeheartedly endorse the determination of His Majesty's Government to prosecute the war until the safety of all those things for which they are fighting is secured. . . .

Let me again appeal . . . for the temporary sinking of political differences in this time of trial and for a united effort in which all parties can join for the common good. That political differences exist we all know only too well, we know that there are deep differences of outlook based on honest and sincere conviction. But at a time of trial such as the present I would hope that we can come together in a way which would take account of those political differences and which would admit of disputes regarding them being put aside, by common consent, until happier times — my own anxiety to see that consummation is well known to you — I have always been, and I remain today, ready and anxious to lend any help I can myself towards it.

The Times, June 20, 1940, p. 6.

Lord Linlithgow, Viceroy and Governor-General: Statement on Constitutional Problem in India, Simla, August 8, 1940

It is clear that earlier differences which had prevented the achievement of national unity remain unbridged. Deeply as His Majesty's Government regret this, they do not feel that they should any longer,

because of those differences, postpone the expansion of the Governor-General's Council, and the establishment of a body which will more closely associate Indian public opinion with the conduct of the war by the Central Government. They have authorized me accordingly to invite a certain number of representative Indians to join my Executive Council. They have authorized me further to establish a War Advisory Council which would meet at regular intervals and which would contain representatives of the Indian States and of other interests in the national life of India as a whole.

The conversations which have taken place and the resolutions of the bodies which I have just mentioned made it clear, however, that there is still in certain quarters doubt as to the intentions of His Majesty's Government for the constitutional future of India and that there is doubt, too, as to whether the position of minorities, whether political or religious, is sufficiently safeguarded in relation to any future constitutional change by assurances already given. There are two main points that have emerged. On those two points His Majesty's Government now desire me to make their position clear.

The first is as to the position of minorities in relation to any future constitutional scheme. It has already been made clear that my declaration of last October does not exclude examination of any part either of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based. His Majesty's Government's concern that full weight should be given to the views of minorities in any revision has also been brought out. That remains the position of His Majesty's Government.

It goes without saying that they could not contemplate transfer of their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India to any system of government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life. Nor could they be parties to the coercion of such elements into submission to such a government.

The second point of general interest is the machinery for building within the British Commonwealth of Nations the new constitutional scheme when the time comes. There has been very strong insistence that the framing of that scheme should be primarily the responsibility of Indians themselves, and should originate from Indian conceptions of the social, economic and political structure of Indian life. His Majesty's Government are in sympathy with that desire and wish to see it given the fullest practical expression, subject to the due fulfilment of the obligations which Great Britain's long connection with India has imposed on her and for which His Majesty's Government cannot divest themselves of responsibility. It is clear that a moment when the Com-

monwealth is engaged in a struggle for existence is not one in which fundamental constitutional issues can be decisively resolved. But His Majesty's Government authorize me to declare that they will most readily assent to the setting up after the conclusion of the war with the least possible delay of a body representative of the principal elements in India's national life in order to devise the framework of the new Constitution, and they will lend every aid in their power to hasten decisions on all relevant matters to the utmost degree. Meanwhile they will welcome and promote in any way possible every sincere and practical step that may be taken by representative Indians themselves to reach a basis of friendly agreement, first upon the form which the post-war representative body should take and the methods by which it should arrive at its conclusions, and secondly, upon the principles and outlines of the Constitution itself. They trust, however, that for the period of the war (with the Central Government reconstituted and strengthened in the manner I have described, and with the help of the War Advisory Council) all parties, communities and interests will combine and cooperate in making a notable Indian contribution to the victory of the world cause which is at stake. Moreover, they hope that in this process new bonds of union and understanding will emerge, and thus pave the way towards the attainment by India of that free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth which remains the proclaimed and accepted goal of the Imperial Crown and of the British Parliament.¹

India and the War, Cmd. 6219 (1940).

Leopold C. M. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India: Statement in the House of Commons, August 14, 1940

The Viceroy's immediate offer, however, does not stand by itself. His initiative has been concerned, as I said just now, not only with India's fuller participation in the actual present war effort, but also with paving the way towards the speedier attainment of the goal at which we are aiming. May I say a word about that goal — Dominion status, as it is commonly described, or, as I prefer to describe it, free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth? It is not, as is so often suggested when Dominion status is contrasted with full independence, an inferior or dependent status. The status of a Dominion — or of this country, for that matter, for our status in the Commonwealth, although not,

¹ See also *India and the War*, statement made by the Governor-General to the Indian Legislature, November 20, 1940, Cmd. 6235.

perhaps, our stature, is the same as theirs — is one not inferior to that of nations that perforce stand alone, but superior. How many so-called independent nations are really free to live their own lives as they will, even when they are not directly overrun or dismembered by more powerful neighbors? We of the British Commonwealth enjoy something more. We enjoy the security, the prosperity, the friendship, the enhanced dignity in the eyes of the world, which come to each of us as the result of our free and equal association. There is no higher status in the world than that. That is the status which we have declared to be the goal of our policy in India.

Our declarations, however, have apparently still left in certain quarters doubts as to the sincerity of our purpose, and have raised, not unnaturally, the question both of the time when and the method by which we mean to fulfil them. It is to that question that the Viceroy, with the full approval of His Majesty's Government, has now given an answer, which marks, I think, a notable step forward on the path to the accepted goal. . .¹

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 364, 876, *India*,
British Library of Information, p. 6-7.

Leopold C. M. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India: Statement in the House of Commons, November 20, 1940

. . . on one main issue, at any rate, there is certainly no divergence among the leaders of Indian opinion, whatever other differences there may be between us or between themselves. They know that the defeat of the British Empire and the victory of the dictatorships would leave India defenseless against inevitable aggression from every quarter by land, by sea or by air. They know more. They know it would mean the end of all their cherished hopes of constitutional progress within India, and in India's relation to the outside world. For them as for us, a Nazi victory would be a death blow to all they care for in the world of politics.

One form in which that sympathy has been expressed has been in the contributions which have poured in spontaneously from Indians in every walk of life, from ruling Princes to working men. . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 365, 2046-7; *The Indian War Effort*, British Library of Information.

¹ See also the statement by Prime Minister Churchill, September 9, 1941, section United Kingdom, p. 210.

Leopold C. M. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India: Statement in the House of Commons, August 1, 1941

. . . It is today a matter of general acceptance that India should, as soon as is practicable, attain to Dominion status or, as I prefer to describe it, to free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth of Nations. How that development is to be expedited, and what provision will still have to be made for fulfillment of the obligation imposed upon us by the past, or by India's present dependence upon this country for her defense, are matters which, however important in themselves, are still matters of detail and method rather than of fundamental principle.

Today the major issue is not whether India should govern herself, but how she is to govern herself. under what type of constitution it is possible to preserve her unity and yet secure freedom and reasonable self-expression for the varied elements which compose her national life. . . .

That brings me to the other half of the policy announced last August. Having deliberately and I venture to say rightly, even necessarily, remitted to Indian hands the framing of India's future Constitution, His Majesty's Government wished, as an interim policy and within the framework of the existing Constitution, to associate Indian leaders more intimately and responsibly with the government of their country during the war. We wished to do so in order to emphasize the undoubted unity of purpose between India and ourselves in this struggle against the evil forces that are as hateful to Indians as to ourselves and for the defense of India's own existence. But we also cherished the hope that in the process of working together in the common cause Indian statesmen would find new bonds of union and understanding among themselves which would help towards a solution of their constitutional problem. . . .¹

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 373, 1682-83; *British Library of Information*, p. 2, 4-5.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Statement in the House of Commons Announcing Sir Stafford Cripps' Mission to India, March 11, 1942

The crisis in the affairs of India arising out of the Japanese advance has made us wish to rally all the forces of Indian life, to guard their land from the menace of the invader.

¹ See *India and the War*; text of announcement issued by the Governor-General of India, July 22, 1941, Cmd. 6293; see also *B.I.N.*, 1941, XVIII, p. 1014-15.

In August 1940,¹ a full statement was made about the aims and policy we are pursuing in India. This amounted, in short, to a promise that, as soon as possible after the war, India should attain Dominion status, in full freedom and equality with this country and the other Dominions, under a Constitution to be framed by Indians, by agreement amongst themselves and acceptable to the main elements in Indian national life. This was, of course, subject to the fulfilment of our obligations for the protection of minorities, including the depressed classes, and of our treaty obligations to the Indian States and to settlement of certain lesser matters arising out of our long association with the fortunes of the Indian subcontinent.

However, Sirs, in order to clothe these general declarations with precision and to convince all classes, races and creeds in India of our sincere resolve, the War Cabinet have agreed unitedly upon conclusions for present and future action which, if accepted by India as a whole, would avoid the alternative dangers either that resistance of a powerful minority might impose an indefinite veto upon the wishes of the majority or that a majority decision might be taken which would be resisted to a point destructive of internal harmony and fatal to the setting up of a new constitution.

We had thought of setting forth immediately the terms of this attempt, by a constructive British contribution, to aid India in the realization of full self-government; we are, however, apprehensive that to make a public announcement at such a moment as this might do more harm than good.

We must first assure ourselves that our scheme would win a reasonable and practical measure of acceptance, and thus promote the concentration of all Indian thought and energies upon the defense of the native soil. We should ill serve the common cause if we made a declaration which would be rejected by essential elements in the Indian world and which provoked fierce constitutional and communal disputes at the moment when the enemy is at the gates of India.

Accordingly, we propose to send a member of the War Cabinet to India, to satisfy himself upon the spot, by personal consultation, that the conclusions upon which we are agreed, and which we believe represent a just and final solution, will achieve their purpose. My right honorable and learned Friend the Lord Privy Seal and leader of the House (Sir Stafford Cripps), has volunteered to undertake this task. He carries with him the full confidence of His Majesty's Government, and he will strive in their name to procure the necessary measure of

¹ See p. 284.

assent, not only from the Hindu majority, but also from those great minorities, amongst which the Moslems are the most numerous and on many grounds pre-eminent.

The Lord Privy Seal will, at the same time, consult with the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief upon the military situation bearing always in mind the paramount responsibility of His Majesty's Government by every means in their power to shield the peoples of India from the perils which now beset them. We must remember that India has a great part to play in the world's struggle for freedom and that her helping hand must be extended in loyal comradeship to the valiant Chinese people, who have fought so long. We must remember also that India is one of the bases from which the strongest counterblows must be struck at the advance of tyranny and aggression.

India (Lord Privy Seal's Mission), U. K., Cmd. 6350 (1942), p. 3; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 545-7.

The Conclusions of the British War Cabinet which Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord Privy Seal, Took to India for Discussion with the Indian Leaders, Published March 30, 1942

His Majesty's Government, having considered the anxieties expressed in this country and in India as to the fulfilment of the promises made in regard to the future of India, have decided to lay down in precise and clear terms the steps which they propose shall be taken for the earliest possible realization of self-government in India. The object is the creation of a new Indian Union which shall constitute a Dominion, associated with the United Kingdom and the other Dominions by a common allegiance to the crown, but equal to them in every respect, in no way subordinate in any aspect of its domestic or external affairs.

His Majesty's Government therefore make the following declaration:

(a) Immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, steps shall be taken to set up in India, in the manner described hereafter, an elected body charged with the task of framing a new Constitution for India.

(b) Provision shall be made, as set out below, for the participation of the Indian States in the constitution-making body.

(c) His Majesty's Government undertake to accept and implement forthwith the Constitution so framed subject only to:

- (i) the right of any Province of British India that is not prepared to accept the new Constitution to retain its present constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession if it so decides.

With such nonacceding Provinces, should they so desire, His Majesty's Government will be prepared to agree upon a new Constitution, giving them the same full status as Indian Union, and arrived at by a procedure analogous to that here laid down.

- (ii) the signing of a Treaty which shall be negotiated between His Majesty's Government and the constitution-making body. This Treaty will cover all necessary matters arising out of the complete transfer of responsibility from British to Indian hands; it will make provision, in accordance with the undertakings given by His Majesty's Government, for the protection of racial and religious minorities; but will not impose any restriction on the power of the Indian Union to decide in the future its relationship to the other Member States of the British Commonwealth.

Whether or not an Indian State elects to adhere to the Constitution, it will be necessary to negotiate a revision of its Treaty arrangements, so far as this may be required in the new situation

- (d) The constitution-making body shall be composed as follows, unless the leaders of Indian opinion in the principal communities agree upon some other form before the end of hostilities:

Immediately upon the result being known of the provincial elections which will be necessary at the end of hostilities, the entire membership of the Lower Houses of the Provincial Legislature shall, as a single electoral college, proceed to the election of the constitution-making body by the system of proportional representation. This new body shall be in number about one tenth of the number of the electoral college.

Indian States shall be invited to appoint representatives in the same proportion to their total population as in the case of the representatives of British India as a whole, and with the same powers as the British Indian members.

- (e) During the critical period which now faces India and until the new Constitution can be framed His Majesty's Government must inevitably bear the responsibility for and retain control and direction of the defense of India as part of their world war effort, but the task of organizing to the full the military, moral, and material resources of India must be the responsibility of the Government of India with the cooperation of the peoples of India. His Majesty's Government desire and invite the immediate and effective participation of the leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people in the counsels of their country, of the Commonwealth, and of the United Nations. Thus they

will be enabled to give their active and constructive help in the discharge of a task which is vital and essential for the future freedom of India.

U. K., Cmd. 6350, p. 4; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 547-9; *International Conciliation*, No. 381 (June 1942), p. 309-10; (for other documentary material relating to the negotiations see *ibid.*).

***Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord Privy Seal and Leader of House of Commons:
Broadcast, New Delhi, March 30, 1942***

.

. . . Our object is to give to the Indian peoples full self-government, with complete freedom as to how they will devise and organize their own constitution.

There are those who claim that India should form a single united country; there are others who say it should be divided up into two, three or more separated countries. There are those who claim that provincial autonomy should be very wide, with a few centrally controlled federal services. Others stress the need for centralization, in view of the growing complexity of economic development.

These and many other various ideas are worthy to be explored and debated. But it is for the Indian people, and not any outside authority, to decide under which of these forms India will in the future govern herself.

If the Indian people ask our help it will, of course, be gladly given. But it is for you, the Indian people, to discuss and decide upon your future constitution. We shall look on with deep interest and hope that your wisdom will guide you truly in this great adventure.

We ask you, therefore, to come together, all religions and races, in a constitution-making body, as soon as hostilities are over, to form your own constitution. We have specified the form which that body will take unless — and this is an important point — the leaders of the principal factions of the Indian people agree between themselves before the end of hostilities upon some other and better form.

That constitution-making body will have as its object the framing of a single constitution for the whole of India — that is, of British India together with such of the Indian States as may decide to join in.

But we realize this very simple fact — if you want to persuade a number of people who are inclined to be antagonistic to enter the same

room, it's unwise to tell them that once they go in there is no way out. They might fear being locked in together.

It's much wiser to tell them they can go in, and if they find they cannot come to a common decision, then there is nothing to prevent those who wish from leaving again by another door. They are much more likely all to go in if they have knowledge that they can, by their free will, go out again if they cannot agree.

Well, that's what we say to the Provinces of India. Come together to frame a common constitution. If you find after all your discussion and all the give-and-take of a constitution-making assembly that you cannot overcome your differences, and that some Provinces are still not satisfied with the constitution, then such Provinces can go out and remain out if they wish, and just the same degree of self-government and freedom will be available for them as for the Union itself — that is to say, complete self-government.

We hope and expect to see an Indian Union, strong and united because it is founded upon the free consent of all its people. But it is not for us Britishers to dictate to you, the Indian people. You will work out and decide your problem for yourselves. So we provide the means and the road by which you can attain that form of the absolute and united self-government which you desire at the earliest possible moment.

In the past we have waited for different Indian communities to come to a common decision as to how a new constitution for a self-government of India should be framed. And because there has been no agreement among the Indian leaders the British Government has been accused by some of using this fact to delay the granting of freedom to India. We are now giving the lead that has been asked for, and it is in the hands of the Indians, and the Indians only, whether they will accept that lead and so attain their own freedom. If they fail to accept this opportunity the responsibility for that failure must rest with them. We ask you to accept this fulfillment of our pledges in the past, and it is that request that I have put before your leaders in the document which you have now seen.

In regard to the position of minority communities within the new Indian Union, I am confident that the constitution-making body will make just provisions for their protection. But in view of the undertaking given to those minorities by His Majesty's Government in the past, we propose that in the treaty, which under the Draft Declaration will be concluded between His Majesty's Government and the constitution-making body, the new Indian Union should undertake to protect the rights of these minorities.

If there should be any nonacceding Provinces, a similar treaty provision would be made in respect to minority communities within their borders

I have already indicated to you the position as to the immediate future. I know that His Excellency the Viceroy has the greatest hope that the acceptance in principle of this document by the leaders of Indian opinion will make it possible for him to start forthwith on the consultations which will enable him to implement the principle laid down in the last paragraph of the document which I have already read over to you.

It contains one essential reservation; that in respect of the responsibility for the war This reservation does not mean that the Governor-General and the Executive Council will, or indeed could be, excluded from taking an effective share in the council for the defense of India.

In this wide-flung war, defense cannot be localized in a single country and its preparation must permeate the activities of every department of government and must demand from every department the fullest cooperation.

If His Majesty's Government are to take full responsibility for the conduct of the naval, military and air defense of India, as it is their duty to do, then the defense of India must be dealt with by them as part of the world war effort on which they are now engaged, with the direction of that defense directly in the hands of the Commander-in-Chief under the War Cabinet and their highest staff officers.

But, as I have already pointed out, the Government of India must also have an effective share in the defense councils. And so we have decided that the Commander-in-Chief should retain his position as a member of the Executive Council.

In order, however, that India will have her full voice in this central control of strategy — defensive and offensive — not only in India herself, but in all the interrelated theaters of war, we have invited the appointment of a representative Indian to the War Cabinet and to the Pacific Council of the United Nations.

That is one of the ways in which India will have her full say in the councils of the Commonwealth and of the United Nations as an equal partner. And when it comes to the making of the peace, India will appoint her own representatives to the peace conference, side by side with those of the other free nations, and so make her contribution to the building of a new world order.

Leopold C. M. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India: Statement in House of Commons, April 28, 1942

.

. . . Our ideal undoubtedly remains a united all-India including the States as well as British India, sufficiently united at any rate to present a common front to the outside world. The unity which we have given to India, a unity of law, of administrative procedure, of economic and transport policy, is an achievement of which we have every right to be proud, but we would sooner see India divided and free than keep her various elements forever chafing against us and against each other under a sense of impotent frustration . . .

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 380, 908; *British Plans*, p. 23.

Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord Privy Seal: Report on His Mission to India Given to the House of Commons, April 28, 1942

.

I stated when I left India that, in default of acceptance, the draft Declaration must be considered as being withdrawn. But this does not and cannot close the door to that closer cooperation which we desire to see in the defense of India or to the solution of the problem of self-government after the war. It means that His Majesty's Government have done their best to make their contribution to the solution of the problem both in the substance of the draft Declaration and in the method of its presentation to the Indian people. For the time being there is nothing further we can do. We must be patient and open-minded, willing to consider any proposals upon which the Indian leaders can agree. But we must concentrate upon our duty to do our utmost for the defense of India, a task in which our great American Allies have generously come forward to offer their help, a help which we and the Indians alike welcome and appreciate. Many of the Indian leaders, too, will do their best to arouse the Indian peoples in their own defense, and I hope that by cooperation in defense we may move a step nearer to the solution of our problem.

Of this I am certain, that the Members of this House, the British people, and all well-wishers of democracy the world over will continue in the hope that through a successful resistance to the brutal aggression of Japan the Indian peoples will reach their goal of self-government and self-determination without internal strife and bitterness, and that thus

India will emerge as a great equal of the free nations of the world able to make her full contribution to the future of a new civilization after the victory of the Allied cause.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 380, 842; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 558-73.

Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord Privy Seal: Broadcast to the United States, London, July 26, 1942

I have always been a firm friend of India and done my best in the past to work for the freedom of India. When I joined the British War Cabinet and found the Government anxious and willing to put forward a proposal for Indian self-government, I volunteered to travel 20,000 miles to India and back to put the case directly to Indian political leaders on behalf of the British Government and people.

We offered to the Indian people complete liberty the moment the war was over to devise and set up their own form of government. We suggested the broad outlines of how they should proceed, but there was no rigidity in those suggestions and it was left open to the various religions and races to agree on some other method. But to my regret they neither accepted nor put forward any agreed alternative. It was not this future arrangement, however, but the immediate situation which caused the Congress Party to reject the proposals.

We offered the representative Indian political leaders immediate office in the Viceroy's Executive Council — a body of ministers like those who advise your President. Mr. Gandhi has demanded that we walk out of India leaving the country filled with deep-rooted religious divisions, without any constitutional form of government or organized administration. No responsible government could take such a step, least of all in the midst of war. The Moslems, of whom there are at least 80,000,000, are deeply opposed to Congress Party domination, as are also the tens of millions of the depressed classes. To have agreed to the Congress Party's or to Mr. Gandhi's demands would have meant inevitable chaos and disorder. This is not merely my assertion. It has been stated by Mr. Gandhi himself. Quite recently he said: "Anarchy is the only way. Someone asked me if there would be anarchy after the British rule. Yes, it will be there. But I tell the British, give us chaos."

India is now an essential and vital part of the world front against the Axis Powers. There are British, American and Chinese forces, as well as the Indians fighting side by side, to defend India against Japan. If the obligations of the British Government to their American and

Chinese allies are observed, we must ensure that India remains a safe base in and from which to operate against the Japanese enemy. We cannot allow conditions to be created by any political party leader in India which will jeopardize the safety of the United Nations' armies or air forces or throw the door open for the advance of our enemies into this new and dangerous theater of war

That is an obligation not only to the British and American forces in India — it is an obligation to the Indian people themselves. That is why your country and mine find themselves both intimately concerned with the condition of India at this moment. Your sons as well as ours are helping to defend India and to wage war against the Japanese. Your policy as well as ours is to defend India. But Gandhi and the Congress Party have other views. Mr. Gandhi I have always regarded with respect as a great nationalist and religious leader. But I am bound to say that in the present circumstances he is not showing himself to be practical or realistic. Certainly the action he is now threatening — mass civil disobedience by his followers — is calculated to endanger both your war effort and our own and to bring the greatest aid and comfort to our common enemies. Gandhi's views are not always easy to follow or consistent, but let me read two of his recent statements.

"We do not want these allied troops for our defense or protection. If luck favors us, the Japanese may see no reason to hold the country after the allies have withdrawn." China will hardly appreciate this

Again Gandhi has said: "American aid amounts in the end to American influence, if not to American rule, added to the British. If the British left India to her fate . . . probably the Japanese would leave India alone." These are solemn words, and what do all of them amount to? Mr. Gandhi is not prepared to wait. He would rather jeopardize the freedom and the whole cause of the United Nations. He threatens extremes of pressure in this most difficult hour to win political power for his own party. There is not the slightest doubt that other large and powerful political parties in India are opposed to Mr. Gandhi's demands.

I regret profoundly that he has taken this attitude, and I know that the Indian people as a whole do not support him. He may gain a measure of support for his mass disobedience, but, for the sake of India as well as for the cause of the United Nations, it will be our duty to insist on keeping India as a safe and orderly base for our joint operations against the Japanese. Whatever steps are necessary to that end, we must take fearlessly. Once victory is gained, India has been offered complete freedom to provide in whatever way she chooses for her own

self-government. But that victory must first be gained. We cannot allow the actions of a visionary, however distinguished in the fight for freedom in the past, to thwart the United Nations' drive for victory in the east. The issue is too grave and too great for the whole world.

American, Chinese, Indian and British soldiers must not be sacrificed in the gallant struggle for the liberty of the world by political party maneuvering in India or any other country. It is the interest of India that is at stake, as well as that of China, Britain and the United States. I am sure that we in this country can rely on you to give us your understanding, your help and your support in doing whatever is necessary to maintain intact the front of the United Nations in India and to reopen the lifeline of our gallant allies, the Chinese.

Bulletins from Britain, 1942, No. 101, p. 11-12.

Leopold C. M. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India: Reply to a Question by Mr. Ammon as to the Government's Intentions in Regard to the Political Situation in India, the House of Commons, July 30, 1942

The purpose of His Majesty's Government with regard to the constitutional future of India was made clear in the draft Declaration which Sir Stafford Cripps was authorized to offer on behalf of His Majesty's Government. It proved impossible to secure the support of the principal elements of India's national life for the specific proposals in that Declaration, and the draft was accordingly withdrawn. Nevertheless, His Majesty's Government stand firmly by the broad intention of their offer.

His Majesty's Government, while reiterating their resolve to give the fullest opportunity for the attainment by India of complete self-government, cannot but solemnly warn all those who stand behind the policy adumbrated by the Working Committee of Congress that the Government of India will not flinch from their duty to take every possible step to meet the situation. The United Nations have bent themselves to the task of fighting the menace which overhangs freedom and civilization. In this crisis and in the future after the war, India has a great part to play, and it is the earnest hope of His Majesty's Government that the Indian people will lend no countenance to a movement fraught with such disastrous consequences but will, on the contrary, throw their all into the struggle against the common enemies of mankind.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 582, 674.

Leopold C. M. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India: Broadcast to the Empire following the Declaration of Civil Disobedience by the Congress Party and the Detention of Mohandas K. Gandhi and Other Congress Leaders,¹ London, August 9, 1942

The forces of stability and constructive patriotism will prevail in India, as in the world, over reckless, totalitarian methods and ambitions. When the hour of victory comes, as assuredly it will, then it will be for Indian statesmanship to make the fullest use of the opportunity to which we have pledged ourselves and to which we remain pledged to devise for India a constitutional framework within which she can live at peace and in unity of spirit within her own borders, and take her rightful place among the free nations of the British Commonwealth and of the world.

Bulletins from Britain, 1942, No. 103, p. 6.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Statement on India to the House of Commons, September 10, 1942

The broad principles of the declaration made by His Majesty's Government, which formed the basis of the Mission of the Lord Privy Seal to India, must be taken as representing the settled policy of the British Crown and Parliament. These principles stand in their full scope and integrity. No one can add anything to them, and no one can take anything away. The good offices of the Lord Privy Seal were rejected by the Indian Congress Party.

This, however, does not end the matter. The Indian Congress Party does not represent all India. It does not represent the majority of the people of India. It does not even represent the Hindu masses. It is a political organization built around a party machine and sustained by certain manufacturing and financial interests. Outside that party and fundamentally opposed to it are the 90,000,000 Moslems in British India who have their rights of self-expression; the 50,000,000 Depressed Classes, or the Untouchables as they are called because they are supposed to defile their Hindu co-religionists by their presence or by their shadow; and the 95,000,000 subjects of the Princes of India with whom we are bound by treaties; in all 235,000,000 in these three large groupings alone, out of about 390,000,000 in all India. This takes no account of large elements among the Hindus, Sikhs and Christians in British India who deplore the present policy of the Congress Party. It is neces-

¹ For further details see *B.I.N.*, 1942, XXIX, p. 729-41.

sary that these main facts should not be overlooked here or abroad, because no comprehension of the Indian problem or of the relations between Britain and India is possible without the recognition of these basic data.

. . . To sum up, the outstanding fact which has so far emerged from the violent action of the Congress Party has been their non-representative character and their powerlessness to throw into confusion the normal peaceful life of India. It is the intention of His Majesty's Government to give all necessary support to the Viceroy and his Executive in the firm but tempered measures by which they are protecting the life of the Indian community and leaving the British and Indian Armies free to defend the soil of India against the Japanese

I may add that large reinforcements have reached India and that the numbers of white soldiers now in that country, though very small compared with its size and population, are larger than at any time in the British connection. I, therefore, feel entitled to report to the House that the situation in India at this moment gives no occasion for undue despondency or alarm.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 383, 303-05.

Lord Linlithgow, Viceroy of India: Speech to the Associated Chambers of Commerce, Calcutta, December 17, 1942

.

. . . We are familiar with the suggestion that the troubles of India are due to Britain's refusal to part with power. I would say exactly the contrary. These troubles are due to Britain's expressed readiness to part with power.

It is because an agreement cannot be reached between the conflicting interests in the country as to who is to take over the responsibilities which we are only too ready to transfer to Indian hands that the deadlock has arisen. It is from no reluctance on our part to transfer them

.

Today I see, with deep regret, little to encourage me in the hope that the conflicting claims are likely in any degree to be abated. But I have not altogether lost hope that the problem is not beyond the genius of Indian leadership and that it may yet be possible for the various parties to come together and cooperate in forming an executive government for this country.

.

British Information Services, New York.

2. THE DOMINIONS

The relation between the United Kingdom and the self-governing Dominions was defined by the Imperial Conference of 1926 in the following terms: "They are autonomous Communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations." In 1931, the Statute of Westminster removed the technical signs of Dominion inferiority of status. The Dominions have followed the British model of Cabinet government but their upper chambers have coordinate legislative authority. In September 1939, the overseas Dominions made their own separate declarations of active participation in World War II. Eire chose to remain neutral.

A. Canada

A Liberal Cabinet under Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King has been in office since October 1935. Canada has had direct diplomatic representation in Washington since 1926.

1939

- Sept. 1 Prime Minister Mackenzie King announced that if the United Kingdom became engaged in war, the Government would recommend to Parliament that Canada also declare war on Germany.
- " 10 After Parliamentary approval, declaration was made of a state of war with Germany.

1940

- Mar. 26 General Election The Liberal Party under Prime Minister Mackenzie King was returned to office.
- Jun. 10 Declaration of state of war with Italy.
- Aug. 18 Ogdensburg Agreement between Canada and the United States setting up the Permanent Joint Board on Defense for the northern half of the Western Hemisphere (see p. 29).

1941

- Apr. 20 Hyde Park Declaration by Prime Minister Mackenzie King and President Roosevelt. Joint statement on general principles on which technical and financial arrangements regarding war materials are based (see p. 304).
- May 1 Materials Coordinating Committee with the United States set up.
- Jun. 17 Joint Economic Committees with the United States established (see p. 41).
- Jul. 26 Notice of abrogation of commercial treaty with Japan.
- Nov. 5 Joint War Production Committee with the United States set up to aid acceleration of production.
- Dec. 7 Declarations of state of war with Japan, Rumania, Hungary and Finland.

1942

- Jan. 5 Joint Board for United Kingdom, United States and Canada established to purchase and allocate raw materials required for war-time production.
- Apr. 10 Joint Agricultural Agreements with the United States.
- Nov. 8 Diplomatic relations with the Vichy Government severed.
- “ 30 Exchange of notes with the United States endorsing the principles set forth in Article VII of the Agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom on Mutual Aid Pursuant to the Lend-Lease Act of March 11, 1941, signed at Washington, February 23, 1942 (termed the Master Agreement) ¹ (see p. 145).

William L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister: Broadcast on the Canadian Government's Policy, September 3, 1939

For months, indeed for years, the shadow of impending conflict in Europe has been ever present. Through these troubled years, no stone has been left unturned, no road unexplored in the patient search for peace.

Unhappily for the world, Herr Hitler and the Nazi regime in Germany have persisted in their attempt to extend their control over other peoples and countries, and to pursue their aggressive designs in wanton disregard of all treaty obligations, and peaceful methods of adjusting international disputes. They have had resort increasingly to agencies of deception, terrorism, and violence. It is this reliance upon force, this lust for conquest, this determination to dominate throughout the world, which is the real cause of the war that today threatens the freedom of mankind.

The fate of a single city, the preservation of the independence of a particular nation, are the occasion, not the real cause of the present conflict. The forces of evil have been loosed in the world in a struggle between the pagan conception of a social order which ignores the individual and is based upon the doctrine of might, and a civilization based upon the Christian conception of the brotherhood of man with its regard for the sanctity of contractual relations and the sacredness of human personality.

As President Roosevelt said on opening Congress on January 4:

There comes a time in the affairs of men when they must prepare to defend not their homes alone, but the tenets of faiths and humanity on which their churches, their governments, and their very civilization are founded. The defense of religion, of democracy, and of good faith among nations is all the same fight. To save one, we must make up our minds to save all.

¹ See section United Nations, p. 10.

This, I believe, is the position in which all nations that cherish free institutions, individual liberty and social justice find themselves today.

I need not review the events of the last few days. They must be present in the minds of all. Despite her unceasing efforts to preserve the peace of Europe, the United Kingdom has today, in the determination to honor her pledges and meet her treaty obligations, become involved in war.

This morning, the King, speaking to his peoples at home and across the seas, appealed to all, to make their own, the cause of freedom, which Britain again has taken up. Canada has already answered that call. On Friday last, the Government, speaking on behalf of the Canadian people, announced that in the event of the United Kingdom becoming engaged in war in the effort to resist aggression, they would, as soon as Parliament meets, seek its authority for effective cooperation by Canada at the side of Britain.

. . . I appeal to my fellow Canadians to unite in a national effort to save from destruction all that makes life itself worth living, and to preserve for future generations those liberties and institutions which others have bequeathed to us.

H. C. Deb , Ottawa, Of. Rept., September 8, 1939, p. 14-15.

William L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister: Broadcast, October 27, 1939

. . . The Nazi doctrine of Force is the very antithesis of what one finds in the Christian Gospel. If it prevails, there will be, as I see it, an end to our Christian civilization. It will prevail unless men are prepared to sacrifice their lives in opposing it. That is why the present war is for the Allied Forces a crusade

The time has come when, to save our Christian civilization, we must be prepared to lay down our lives for its preservation. The young men who are enlisting in our forces today, to serve on land, on the sea and in the air, are first and foremost defenders of the Faith. Like others who have gone forth to battle in the past, they are placing their lives at the service of King and Country, but theirs is an even greater mission. It is the preservation, for our own and future generations, of the freedom begotten of persecutions, martyrdoms, and centuries of struggle. It is the preservation not alone of national and of personal freedom, but of freedom also of the mind and of the soul.

*The Issue in the Present War, Broadcast by
Prime Minister King, Ottawa, 1939, p. 14.*

William L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister: Broadcast on Canada's War Effort, June 7, 1940

. . . We are the bridge between the old world and the new; the bridge which joins the new freedom of the North American Continent with the ancient freedom of Britain which gave it birth. We will stand resolute to defend its approaches and its abutments. . . .

New Situations and Responsibilities, Broadcasts by Prime Minister King, Ottawa, 1940, p. 11.

Ogdensburg Agreement: Joint Statement of the President (Roosevelt) and the Prime Minister of Canada (Mackenzie King), Ogdensburg, N. Y., August 18, 1940

[For text see section United States, p. 29.]

D. S. Bul., III, p. 154; *D.A.F.R.*, III, p. 160.

William L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister: Speech in the House of Commons on the Ogdensburg Agreement, November 12, 1940

. . . the agreement marks the full blossoming of a long association in harmony between the people of Canada and the people of the United States. . . . The link forged by the Canada-United States defense agreement is no temporary axis. It was not formed by nations whose common tie is a mutual desire for the destruction of their neighbors. It is part of the enduring foundation of a new world order, based on friendship and good will. In the furtherance of this new world order, Canada, in liaison between the British Commonwealth and the United States, is fulfilling a manifest destiny.

. . . Any part which our country may have had in bringing about a harmony of sentiment between the British Empire and the United States may well be a legitimate source of pride to all Canadians. In the midst of the darkness which today enshrouds mankind, the relations between the United States and the British Commonwealth shine forth as the one great beam of hopeful light left in the world. . . .

H. C. Deb., Ottawa, Of. Rept., November 12, 1940, p. 5, 8.

Hyde Park Declaration:*¹ *A Joint Statement of the President of the United States (Roosevelt) and the Prime Minister of Canada (Mackenzie King), Hyde Park, N. Y., April 20, 1941

[For text see *D. S. Bul.*, IV, p. 494; *D.A.F.R.*, III, p. 161.]

¹ This Declaration is primarily concerned with means to enable Canada to meet its exchange difficulties caused through heavy purchasing in the United States. Canada has not accepted lend-lease aid.

Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice: Broadcast, June 1, 1941

.

We are fighting first for survival. But we are also fighting for what Hitler took away from the Germans and would take away from us: our liberties, our ways of life, our trade unions, the freedom to do and say what we please.

No sacrifice is too great to check the black plague of the 20th century which is fighting to set us back to the 13th.

Canada is fighting for what we have not lost here and what we will always struggle to preserve. . . .

"Till the Hour of Victory," Ottawa, 1941, p. 10.

Formation of Joint Economic Committees, Canada and United States,¹ June 17, 1941

[For text of Statement of the Department of State, see section
United States, p. 41]

William L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister, Address at the Lord Mayor's Luncheon in His Honor, London, September 4, 1941²

. . . Canada is proud of her position in the sisterhood of the British Commonwealth. But that position and association, had other reasons been lacking, would not have sufficed to bring Canada into a European war. Ours was not an automatic response to some mechanical organization of Empire. Canada's entry into the war was the deliberate decision of free people, by their own representatives in a free parliament.

Canada is a nation of the new world. As a nation of the new world, we placed ourselves freely at Britain's side because Britain's cause was the cause of freedom, not in this island alone, not in the British Empire alone, not in the old world alone, but everywhere in the world. . . .

¹ Other joint committees include the Materials Coordination Committee established May 1941 and the Joint War Production Committee set up November 1941.

² See also Mr. King's welcome to Wendell L. Willkie at the opening of the Canadian War Services Fund Campaign in Toronto, March 24, 1941 (*A New World Order*, Ottawa, 1941, p. 8), and broadcast on June 1, 1941 (*"Till the Hour of Victory,"* Ottawa, 1941, p. 4 and 5); his address at a dinner of the Associated Canadian Organizations of New York City, June 17, 1941 (*Canada's Contribution to Freedom*, Ottawa, 1941, p. 16-18).

. . . We are fighting to defend democratic and Christian ideals. We believe that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war. The right of men, rich and poor, to be treated as men; the right of men to make the laws by which they shall be governed; the right of men to work where they will, at what they will; the right of womankind to the serenity and sanctity of the home; the right of children to play in safety under peaceful heavens; the right of old men and women to the tranquillity of their sunset; the right to speak the truth in our hearts; the right to worship in our own way, the God in whom we believe. . . .

. . . Much is being said about a new world order to take the place of the old world order when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain. A new world order cannot be worked out at some given moment and reduced to writing at a conference table. It is not a matter of parchments and of seals. That was one of the mistaken beliefs at the end of the last war.

A new world order, to be worthy of the name, is something that is born, not made. It is something that lives and breathes; something that needs to be developed in the minds and hearts of men; something that touches the human soul. It expresses itself in good will and in mutual aid. It is the application, in all human relations, of the principle of helpfulness and service. It is based, not on fear, greed and hate, but on mutual trust and the noblest qualities of the human heart and mind. It seeks neither to divide nor to destroy. Its aim is brotherhood, its method cooperation.

While the old order is destroying itself, this new relationship of men and nations already has begun its slow but sure evolution. It found expression when Britain determined to put an end to aggression in Europe; when other nations of the British Commonwealth took their place at the side of Britain; and when the United States resolved to lend its powerful aid to the nations which are fighting for freedom. It has found its latest expression in the Atlantic Charter. All these factors are combining to create one great brotherhood of freedom-loving peoples.

It must now be wholly clear that if the new world order, based upon freedom, is to assume definite shape, this can only be effected through the leadership of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America working in whole-hearted cooperation toward this great end. On such a foundation of unity of purpose and effort all free peoples may well hope to build an enduring new world order. . . .

Canada and the War, The Lord Mayor's Luncheon: Ottawa, 1941, p. 7, 12.

William L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister: Broadcast following the Declaration of the Existence of a State of War between Canada and Japan, December 8, 1941

. . . In Parliament and out of Parliament, from the very beginning of the war, I have stressed two things: the first, the world aspect of the danger; the second, the moral character of the issue.

It has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict. Nazi aggression against a single country in Europe rapidly developed into aggression over the face of the entire continent. From Europe, it spread to Africa. In Asia, Japanese aggression began years ago with an attack on China. Japan's attack upon United States' and British possessions in the Orient has brought the war to the continent of America. It is now a war of hemispheres as well as of continents. To the Battle of the Atlantic has been added the Battle of the Pacific. The world-encircling danger has grown into actual conflict in all quarters of the globe. This continent, through the combined actions of the Axis Powers, has been drawn into a world conflict to the extent of its entire resources. We have all come to see that no nation is sufficient unto itself, no continent and no hemisphere great enough in its own strength to maintain its freedom. The struggle has now reached the point where it has become nothing less than a matter of preserving freedom itself, and of saving the world from a condition of universal anarchy and chaos.

As to the issue, there can be no longer any question. Japan's latest aggression proves beyond doubt that the Axis partners are joined together in an attempt at world domination. The conflict fundamentally is one between reliance upon force and reliance upon reason; between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization; between a social order which ignores the individual and one which respects the sacredness of human personality. It is a conflict between tyranny and democracy. It is a struggle which verily will decide whether mankind is to become increasingly free or revert to a condition of existence which is worse than slavery. Let us never forget that everything which free men value and cherish, on this side of the grave, is in peril in this war.

War on All Continents, Broadcasts by Prime Minister King,
Ottawa, 1941, p. 10-11

William L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister: Address to the American Federation of Labor Convention, Toronto, October 9, 1942

. . . We are all agreed that we are fighting this war for freedom. I doubt, however, if we yet fully understand what freedom really is.

Freedom, I would define as the absence of fear. As men's fears increase, so their freedom is lost. Man is only free to the extent that he has eliminated fear. . . .

Today, our freedom, as nations and individuals, is menaced by the overpowering fear of Fascist domination. There is but one way to destroy that fear. It is to destroy the powers which are striving to dominate and enslave all peoples on all continents.

The overthrow of despotism based upon the military might of Germany and Japan is only part of the vast undertaking which the free nations of the world have still before them if true Freedom is to be attained. Until the enemy is defeated, we must bend all our energies to the elimination of the one great fear of world domination and world slavery. But this is merely a clearing of the ground on which the structure of a new order will rest.

Next to the fear of war, the greatest fear today, to most men, is the fear of unemployment. It is one of the bitter ironies of our time that full employment has been achieved only as a result of war. Men everywhere are asking the question: Why, if there is no lack of work in war-time, is work not to be had at a time when men, instead of devoting themselves to the work of destruction, might enjoy the fruits of their labor?

I believe the war is teaching us that the obstacles to full employment were not real obstacles; that a partnership of management, of workers and of the community can make useful work available, in time of peace no less than in time of war, for all who need or want to work.

When the war is won, there will be an immense task to repair the great physical destruction caused by war; there will be a pent-up demand for all the goods and services which are increasingly denied in war-time; there will be the huge task of providing food for the starving peoples of the old world. These tasks alone will provide work for millions of men and women for many years.

But the work of repairing and restoring the ravages of war will not be enough. Fortunately, we are also learning that the only limit to our productive capacity is the limit of our resources, and our will and skill to use them to satisfy human need instead of human greed.

Before the war, we talked about the conservation of natural resources. Unhappily, we heard much less about the conservation of human resources — the lives and health and happiness of men and women and children. Today, our aim is total mobilization of resources and of manpower for the waging of total war. When the war is over, we must seek above all else, to use our natural and material resources to conserve

human resources — to promote the health and happiness of all the people. Our resources of land, of sea, of forest, and of mine, were given to man by the Creator for the preservation, and not for the destruction of life. The people of no country can be made happy, contented and prosperous except by safeguarding the lives and welfare of the many, and by protecting from injustice and misfortune the homes of the humble in the land.

The fear of unemployment which arises where, despite a willingness to work, work is not to be had, is only one of many fears which arise out of a sense of insecurity to haunt the minds of the workers. These fears arise where, through inadequate compensation, sickness, invalidity or accident, the capacity to earn is gradually, if not wholly, lost. Fears arise where extra outlays to meet the most immediate of family needs result in extra privation. Fear is ever present at the mere thought of age being confronted with the alternative of poverty or dependence. Until these fears have been eliminated, the war for freedom will not be won.

A new world order will come into being only as the legitimate fears of mankind are removed. The old order has been based on fear, resulting in conflict alike in industrial and in international relations. The new order must be based on faith, leading to cooperation between the parties in industry and to cooperation among the nations of the world. The new order must be based on human rights; not on the rights of property, privilege, or position. The new order must be a world order. It must be governed by a universal rule of law. To bring the new order into being, we shall need a spiritual, not a material interpretation of life. In estimating human values, the new order will be concerned with men's character and personality, not with their power and position, nor with the extent of their possessions. The souls of men will be more precious than their bodies.

The era of freedom will be achieved only as social security and human welfare become the main concern of men and nations.

It is necessary that social security and human welfare should be expressed in definite terms. It is, however, not my purpose to attempt a blueprint of the new order. Of the kind of objectives I have in mind, I would merely mention the following as a national minimum: useful employment for all who are willing to work; standards of nutrition and housing, adequate to ensure the health of the whole population; social insurance against privation resulting from unemployment, from accident, from the death of the breadwinner, from ill health, and from old age.

In war, the preservation of the existence of the community is placed

before the interests of individuals or groups. Here, too, is a lesson for meeting the problems of peace.

By placing the interests of the community before the interests of individuals or groups; by social control, in which government, labor and management all share, human well-being can be vastly increased.

Monopoly of control must give way to joint control in all that pertains in industrial relations. I should like to see labor-management committees to every industry in our country. I should like to see production committees in every branch of agricultural effort. Happily the principle of the partnership of management, of workers and the community is making steady progress. Where it is tried, it is proving its worth. It is only by fully realizing and accepting this partnership that the necessities of industry can be harmonized with the hopes of humanity.

The war has shown us that the way of monopoly, of unrestricted power, is a way that leads to destruction, desolation and death. The only path of prosperity and of peace is, I believe, the path of equality, of cooperation, and of human brotherhood. . . .

None of us would willingly do anything to contribute to a Nazi victory. There is, however, a subtle danger that such might be the effect of Nazi propaganda. We begin to hear it said that the war must end in a stalemate — in some kind of compromise. This is a dangerous suggestion for the very reason that it exploits many of our deepest fears: — the fear of the hardships, burdens and sacrifices of war; the fear of the bloodshed and horrors of war, the fear of the loss of our loved ones. It is the old idea that we are not our brothers' keepers; that what happens in other continents need not be our concern. It hints at a compromise between slavery in the old world and freedom in the new.

Those of you who are Americans have but to turn back the pages of your own history to know that such a compromise cannot endure. Compromise nearly destroyed the American Union. To attempt such a compromise today would, in the end, be no less fatal to the future of the world.

Consider what it would mean. At best, it would be an armistice. Both sides would have to be prepared for a renewal of the struggle. This continent would remain an armed camp. All the burdens, all the restrictions which are accepted as a temporary necessity, would become a permanent feature of our lives. The greater part of our energies, our wealth and our resources would have to be devoted to the building up of armaments. By bitter competition, our standards of living and human well-being would gradually be dragged down to the levels which Germany and Japan are imposing on Europe and Asia.

Without the hope of a better future which now sustains us, the burden would become unbearable. In the end, it would lead to internal dissension which would play into the hands of the totalitarian conquerors, or it would lead to repression on this continent little better than domination from abroad. There can be no compromise with the evil forces of domination. The world cannot endure half-slave and half-free . . .

Labour and the War, Ottawa, 1942.

Agreement with the United States regarding Post-War Economic Settlements. Exchange of Notes between the Secretary of State (Hull) and the Minister to the United States (McCarthy), November 30, 1942

[For form of note see section United States, p 145, for summary of agreement and text of notes see *D. S. Bul.*, VII, p 977-9]

William L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister: Address to the Pilgrims of the United States, New York, December 2, 1942

. . . The recognition by Canada and the United States of joint interest in their common security subsequently found expression in the Ogdensburg Agreement establishing the Permanent Joint Board on Defense. A similar community of interest in war production found expression in the Hyde Park Declaration.

Only the other day, another vast achievement of Canadian-American cooperation was virtually completed. I refer, of course, to the military highway to Alaska. Confronted with a common problem of making the west coast secure, our two countries saw the necessity of a series of military airfields between the United States and Alaska as a vital strategic factor in the defense of both our countries. We also saw the need for a military highway which would connect the airfields, and itself be a supply route to Alaska. To this great enterprise, fraught with possibilities as yet untold, Canada contributed the airfields, the United States the highway.

The United States and Canada in working out their joint plans of military and economic cooperation have done much more than provide a strong defense for this continent. As our two countries already have done with the Rush-Bagot agreement, through the International Joint Commission, and in our reciprocal trade agreements, we have created a working model of international cooperation.

In an exchange of notes which took place today,¹ the Governments of Canada and the United States have recorded their agreement as to the

¹ See p. 145.

major objectives of post-war international economic policy. To these objectives most of the other United Nations have also subscribed.

This agreement on general principles is only a beginning. It remains to translate its aims into definite policies. This once achieved, we shall again have afforded a constructive example of the way in which common policies can be worked out to serve mutual ends, and to meet the practical needs of mankind.

It is now wholly apparent that Britain and the United States have a common interest in the defeat of the Axis Powers. It is equally clear that the common interest extends to all parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and to all the United Nations. We who are still free should appreciate to the full what we owe to other countries. We cannot begin to measure the debt we owe to those countries which have been invaded; and which, at a sacrifice of life, altogether unparalleled, have kept fighting on in order to preserve their freedom. Nor can we say what we also owe to those countries which have lost their freedom. If we on this continent have thus far escaped invasion, either by German forces from across the Atlantic, or by Japanese forces from across the Pacific, it is because of the resistance of other nations.

Who will say that the freedom of all nations might not have been lost but for the resistance of the Chinese and the Russians? Who can begin to estimate what freedom owes to the people of Czechoslovakia to the Poles, to the Norwegians, to the Dutch, to the Belgians, to the Yugoslavs and to the Greeks? Who can estimate the debt that freedom owes to the Fighting French? Today, we pay a special tribute to the patriotism and sacrifice of the brave officers and men of the French fleet at Toulon, who have revealed anew the true spirit of France. In spirit, the people of France always have been of the company of free nations.

Every nation that resisted the foe, however short its resistance may have been, has contributed something to the preservation of freedom, something to the ultimate destruction of the Axis Powers. Every day gained by their resistance afforded precious time to the countries that were still free to build up their strength and to combine their forces. Perhaps, by now, we have learned that it is to mutual aid we owe the liberty we still enjoy. It is not less true of nations, than of individuals that "None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself."

It is quite true that, in no small measure, self-defense has been the motive which has caused us to seek the defeat of the enemy in lands and on shores other than our own. The war is teaching us all that the things we hold in common are so much greater than the things that divide. It

is helping to enforce the truth that "we are members one of another." We are learning that to preserve our common heritage we must help each other all we can, wherever the need is apparent, as soon and as much as we can.

For the nations that are still free today's task is in large part one of self-preservation. Let no successes of the hour minimize the magnitude of that task. Only a supreme effort, on every front, can save suffering and sacrifice greater than all that has gone before.

Tomorrow's task, which is a part of today's, will be one of liberation of the countries which have lost their freedom. For the war has taught that freedom is one and indivisible. Without freedom there can be no lasting peace; and without peace, there can be no enduring freedom. If peace and freedom are to be our portion, an end must be put, once and for all, to aggression and domination on the part of any power.

I believe it will yet be seen by the peoples of Germany, Italy and Japan that, to the countries which have broken the might of their military regimes, they will owe a freedom which otherwise would have been lost to them for centuries.

Liberation once achieved, there will remain the task of restoration; and restoration, if it is to look to the future rather than to the past, means transformation as well. In that transformation we must aim at economic freedom, not less than political freedom.

. . . true freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And, with heart and hand, to be
Earnest to make others free!

In a recent message I received from Chiang Kai-shek, the Generalissimo of China said:

We are now fighting shoulder to shoulder against the forces of evil until victory is won. When peace comes I trust that we shall continue to work together, then as now, in that spirit of closest cooperation for the making of a new world which will secure freedom and equality for all.

. . . For Germany to win this war would mean the destruction of the free spirit of man. It is ours to keep inviolate the majesty of the human spirit. It is ours to defend the fortress of man's soul.

The war for freedom will not have been won when the fear of Nazi and Japanese domination has been destroyed. The era of freedom will be achieved only as human welfare and social security become the main concern of men and nations. The new order must be a world order. It

must be governed by a universal rule of law. It must be based on human rights and not on the rights of property, privilege or position.

In the modern world nationalism is the strongest political force, industrialism the strongest economic force. Over many years, in both Germany and Japan, nationality and industry were perverted from their true purpose, which is the service of humanity, to the false ends of material power and world domination. If men are to be truly free, both nationality and industry must be made to serve, not to enslave mankind.

To have nationality and industry serve humanity, an end must be put to monopoly of power by any country and by any class. In both, there must be government by consent. In the state and industry, control should be broadly representative and not narrowly autocratic. In the new order, economic freedom will be as important as political freedom.

The war has shown us that the way of monopoly, of unrestricted power, whether political or economic, is a way that leads to destruction, desolation and death. The only path to prosperity and peace is the path of equality, of cooperation and of human brotherhood. The hope of the future lies in the universal recognition of our common humanity.

We deplore the extension of war to all parts of the world. In the perspective of time, this may yet prove to have been a blessing in disguise. Only in this way, perhaps, could we have come to realize that the interests of mankind are one, and that the claims of humanity are supreme.

I have sought to give their meaning to the storms of human passion which have swept the oceans of the world, and arrayed nations, continents and hemispheres alike, in conflict the one against the other. It is a conflict which owes its origin to two wholly different interpretations of life, and of the purpose of life: the one, material; the other, spiritual. We have seen to what destruction and desolation the material interpretation has led.

The spiritual interpretation of life teaches us that all human life is sacred; that we are members one of another; that the things which we have in common are greater than those which divide; that each is his brother's keeper. Those great truths have been given new meaning by the war. The way of cooperation and mutual aid is not only the road to victory for the United Nations; it is also the path to freedom and equality for all.

Victory and peace, some day, will crown the sacrifices of those who fight for freedom. When that day comes the peoples of the British Com-

monwealth and the people of the United States will be found at each other's side, united more closely than ever. But they will be part of a larger company. In that company all the nations now united in the defense of freedom will remain united in the service of mankind.

The Defence of Common Liberties, Ottawa, 1942, p. 8-11.

B. Australia

A United Australia Cabinet came into office on April 26, 1939, with Robert Gordon Menzies as Prime Minister. It did not control a majority in the House of Representatives and was dependent on the support of the Country Party. The Labor Party formed the official opposition.

1939

- Sept. 3 Declaration of state of war with Germany
- Nov. 13 Reconstruction of the ministry.

1940

- Jan. 8 Direct diplomatic representation established in Washington
- Jun. 11 Declaration of state of war with Italy.
- Sept. 21 General election held without resulting in a majority for any party. Efforts to form a National government failed.
- Oct. 27 Coalition Cabinet, including representatives of the United Australia and the Country Parties, assumed office under Prime Minister Menzies.

1941

- Aug. 29 Prime Minister Menzies resigned. A. W. Fadden, leader of the Country Party, became Prime Minister, continuing the coalition of the Country Party and the United Australia Party.
- Oct. 6 Prime Minister Fadden resigned following a defeat over the budget. The Labor Party formed a Cabinet and John Curtin became Prime Minister.
- Dec. 8 Declarations of state of war with Japan, Hungary, Rumania and Finland

1942

- Jan. 14 Declaration of state of war with Bulgaria.
- Sept. 3 Exchange of notes on reciprocal lend-lease aid with the United States. Adherence to the principles of master agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States, signed Feb. 23, 1942.

Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister: Report of Declaration,¹ October 17, 1939

Our first objective in that capacity (as a member of the British Commonwealth) was the protection of small nations which had a great part to play in this world and had made great contributions to it. Secondly,

¹ See also Mr. Menzies' declarations of September 7, 1939 (*The Times*, September 8, 1939, p. 7), and of October 4, 1939 (*ibid.*, October 6, 1939, p. 7)

we did not seek territorial gains. There must be no attempt to suppress the ordinary German people, whom we wanted to have the same conception of freedom and the same rights and liberty as ourselves. We are not fighting merely for the map of Europe 12 months ago or any map of Europe. We had an open mind on all questions of merit.

He (Mr. Menzies) hoped the victorious Allies would proceed to re-erect the map of Europe with the idea of restoring not old boundaries but true justice and independence, and the true lines of demarcation between self-respecting nations wishing to contrive their salvation according to their own ideas. Finally, we should think how to prevent another war. We should not be skeptical of collective security, international agreements, and leagues of nations. What we did with the League was to ask an untrained man to do a record high jump. There would be no permanent peace through alliances and counter-alliances. There must be some international outlawry of war to which every world power would subscribe.

The Times, October 18, 1939, p. 7.

Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister: Report of Declaration¹ on War and Peace Aims, November 15, 1939

The first, urgent, and paramount aim was victory — not for the humiliation of the German people and not for spoils, but for the future peace and happiness of simple men and women throughout the world. Our people, while hating war, had also a great hatred of the evil spirit which animated German policy and racked the world. We could not compromise on peace, justice, freedom, and the sane settlement of disputes. Either we had these or we had not. There must be justice and quiet living for the weak as well as the strong. It was a great and humane cause.

Our second aim was, after victory, a better Europe and a better world, with security for peoples of independent race and tradition, the revival of the peaceful associations of trade and commerce, the abandonment of the mad competition in armaments, and a prosperity in which Germany would share. We wanted freedom and equity for the Germans as well as for ourselves. We did not want to make a slave state out of Germany, but to destroy the barbarous German philosophy which made others into slaves.

The Times, November 16, 1939, p. 8.

¹ See also Mr. Menzies declaration of December 20, 1939 (*The Times*, December 21, 1939, p. 8)

John McEwen, Minister for External Affairs: Statement in the House of Representatives,¹ following the Invasion of Norway, April 18, 1940

... So far as the enemy is concerned, the German leader is a desperate and determined man, with a deep-seated lust for power, and under his control is a mighty fighting force. He is not bound by any scruples of morality and legality and at any moment he thinks fit, he may make new moves which would involve new dangers. To face such possibilities the British Empire and its Allies will need all their determination and courage and the fullest organization of their resources. It is the Government's firm resolve and I am positive the resolve of the whole of the Australian people that Australia should play her full part in removing from the world this evil force which threatens all we hold most vital.

Australia, *C.N I.A.*, May 1, 1940, p. 200.

Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister: Speech at Melbourne, July 21, 1940

If we were to accept his (Hitler's) domination and enslavement of Europe, there would be derisive laughter of the whole British world. What we have said we shall fight for we will fight for until we have won. ... He (Hitler) has offered an easy peace, on the condition that the British Empire should betray the cause of honesty, freedom, and humanity.

Peace must come to us, as to all Christian peoples, through suffering which will represent the triumph of all that makes life worth living. . . . We are determined to use British sea power to the full until victory has restored real life and liberty to Europe.

The Times, July 22, 1940, p. 4.

Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister: Report of Speech at Camberwell, New South Wales, September 2, 1940

They (the Australian Government) . . . would remember that the Empire was fighting not for the spoils of victory but for a better world in which a fair deal need not be called a new deal.

The Times, September 3, 1940, p. 4.

¹ See also his speech in the House of Representatives, August 6, 1940 Australia, *C.N I.A.*, August 15, 1940, p. 96-102.

Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister: Address in the House of Commons, Ottawa, May 7, 1941

. . . nothing else matters except that when this war is over we should live in a free world, in the kind of world in which we want to live.

What does it matter if we come out into that world bankrupt? What does it matter if we come out into that world with lower standards of material living than we have now? What does it matter if in that world the rich are not so rich? What does it matter if in the last resort the business of statesmanship in that new world becomes the business of sharing justly a new and honorable poverty? These things do not matter. The only thing that matters to free men is that the policies under which they live shall be the policies which they themselves have devised as the representatives of their own people.

.
Two Addresses by Rt. Hon. Robert Gordon Menzies,
Ottawa, 1941, p. 7-8.

*Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister: Address before the National Press Club, Washington, May 12, 1941*¹

. . . This war has been described by at least one man as a "mere intra-European struggle." I should like to say what I think about that. Why is Australia fighting in this "intra-European struggle"?

.

Is the reason that . . . we are still carrying out the orders of Great Britain, the orders of a European power saying to her docile dominions all over the world, "Here, come along, pour out all your lives, pour out all your treasure, in order that we may be able to do something about this intra-European struggle." Gentlemen, I don't hesitate to say, and I hope I abuse no hospitality at all when I say it — I am speaking as a man to men — this nonsense about intra-European struggle is of all nonsense that I have listened to the worst. This is not a struggle for some European political problem. I don't care a hoot for the internal politics of Europe. Not a hoot. I care a great deal for the liberty of this world and I care a great deal for the liberty of the people whom I am proud to represent.

This, Sir, is no battle for the politics of Europe. This is a battle for humanity; nothing less, for humanity. . . .

Menzies, R. G., *A People's War*, p. 117.

¹ See also speech of Richard G. Casey, Minister to the United States, Charlottesville, Va., July 2, 1941. (Institute of Public Affairs, Univ. of Va.)

Sir Frederick Stewart, Minister for External Affairs: Broadcast, July 22, 1941

I feel that I can voice the opinion of most of the people of Australia when I say: We will welcome peace; but we do not want peace that will simply be a pause between two wars. We want a sound and lasting peace which will afford an opportunity of constructing a world in which humanity may be able to rise to the best of which it is capable. Peace, in order to be sound and lasting, must be based on certain principles. It must be based on the sanctity of treaties and other undertakings between nations and an expectation of the honorable discharge of the obligations of one state to another. We cannot, therefore, hope for a lasting peace with a perjured government which has shown itself incapable of filling this basic requirement. Peace must be based on justice and therefore we cannot hope for a lasting peace with a tyrannical government that is still coercing and oppressing weaker states. Peace must be based on agreement and not on force and therefore we cannot hope for peace with a bullying government that proclaims and has always tried to enforce the doctrine that might is right. . . .

Australia, *C.N.I.A.*, August 1, 1941, p. 49.

John Curtin, Prime Minister: Report of Speech in Launching the Liberty Loan, Sydney, February 17, 1942

. . . We are the sons and daughters of Britishers; we come from England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, and there are fused in us the best qualities of these peoples.

They would not give up their dream that in the South Pacific they would create a nation which could be an example to all others; rather would they fight now for what they had, so that ultimately they might realize that dream.

B.I.N., 1942, XIX, 5, p. 95.

John Curtin, Prime Minister: Broadcast to the United States, March 13, 1942

We fight with what we have, and what we have is our all. We fight for the same free institutions that you enjoy. We fight so that in the words of Lincoln, government of the people, for the people, by the people, shall not perish from the earth. Our legislature is elected the same as is yours, and we will fight for it and for the right to have it, just as you will fight to keep the Capitol at Washington the meeting

place of freely-elected men and women, representative of a free people. . . . I give you the pledge of my country. There will always be an Australian Government, and there will always be an Australian people. We are too strong in our hearts, our spirit is too high, the justice of our cause throbs too deeply in our being, for that high purpose to be overcome.

I may be looking down a vista of weary months of soul-shaking reverses, of grim struggle, of back-breaking work; but as surely as I sit here talking to you across the war-tossed Pacific Ocean, I see our flag, I see Old Glory, I see the proud banner of the heroic Chinese, I see the standard of the valiant Dutch.

And I see them flying high in the wind of liberty, over a Pacific from which aggression has been wiped out, over peoples restored to freedom, and flying triumphant as the glorified symbols of United Nations strong in will and in power to achieve decency and dignity, unyielding to evil in any form.

I-A.R., 1942, II, 4, p. 71.

John Curtin, Prime Minister: Address to the Royal Empire Society, Sydney, May 18, 1942

Let it be clearly and definitely understood that the relationship between Australia and the United States, between Australia and Canada and between Australia and New Zealand is covered by one supreme purpose — retaining Australia as an integral part of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Release of the Australian News and Information Bureau, May 18, 1942.

Herbert V. Evatt, Attorney-General and Minister for External Affairs: • Statement on International Affairs before the House of Representatives, September 3, 1942¹

. . . While I was in London, the treaty of alliance between Britain and Soviet Russia was negotiated and signed. This treaty reaffirmed the principles laid down in the declaration of the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941. Because the Soviet and Japan are at peace, the treaty was directed very specifically against Hitlerite Germany and Germany's

¹ See his speech at Canberra, June 11, 1942, and also Prime Minister John Curtin's statement on the same date. (Australian Information Service, N Y.C.)

satellite associates in Europe. But, in my opinion, the broader and more important features of the treaty are the provisions directed to the post-war period. Thus Article 3 binds the parties to adopt common action to preserve peace and to resist aggression in the post-war period. The Anglo-Russian alliance is to continue for a period of twenty years after the war. It was agreed that, during the post-war period, both parties should work together for the organization of economic prosperity.

M. Molotov showed the liveliest and most friendly interest in this country, with the history of which he seemed well acquainted. As I told him, Australia regards Russia not only as a great European power but as a great Pacific power. It is essential to the future of the Pacific that Australia should always remain on the closest terms of friendship with Russia. The Government hopes that, in the very near future, that friendship will be evidenced and confirmed.

It is becoming more and more clear that the military overthrow of our enemies, although our primary aim, will in no way be obstructed but will be assisted if positive plans are now laid as to the course to be pursued in the post-war period.

In this connection the past declarations of the leaders of the United Nations are an important starting point, especially the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the President's subsequent declaration of the Four Freedoms.

While in the United States, I found many who were particularly anxious to have promulgated a special charter covering the future of the peoples of the Pacific and of Southeast Asia. Why not, it was said, establish a Pacific and Asiatic charter on the lines of the Atlantic Charter? This question shows a misunderstanding of the true position.

By subscribing to the Atlantic Charter all the United Nations have now declared —

First: Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second: They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third: They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

The United Nations have also expressed their hope for a peace which will "afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." (The Sixth principle.) They have also declared that, while they believe in the eventual abandonment of the use of force, aggressor nations must

be disarmed pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security (Eighth principle)

But the name *Atlantic Charter* which has been given to this declaration does not refer only to the Atlantic region or to powers having interests in the Atlantic. The Charter derives its name from the place where it was signed. The twenty-eight nations which have subscribed to it extend around the globe, and the declaration is universal in its scope and application. It follows that the future of the regions of the Pacific and of Southeast Asia are to be governed by the broad principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Some consequences of this may properly be suggested. The first principle which must be applied is that of security. Accordingly, in keeping with the Eighth principle of the Charter, there should be established a system of general security which will be as effective in these Pacific and Asiatic regions as in all other parts of the world. Pending the establishment of such a system, the aggressor must be disarmed. And that aggressor is Japan — the only Pacific power which since 1931 has systematically employed its armed forces for the purpose of territorial aggrandizement.

While security comes first, the Charter also assures to the peoples of Southeastern Asia and the Southwest Pacific that they shall be able to live out their lives in freedom from want as well as in freedom from fear. These peoples cannot be excluded from the system of economic collaboration which the United Nations have envisaged.¹ Again, it is elementary that the future development of the people of China will no longer be obstructed by such restrictions on their self-respect and their right of self-government as are involved in the almost exploded doctrine of extraterritoriality.² Equally we look forward to the people of India developing into a truly self-governing nation. It is to be hoped that they will soon understand that self-governing British Dominions like Australia are none the less self-governing because they owe allegiance to the King or because they are associated together as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations or because they are resolved to resist the invader to the death.

Australia, as one of the countries of the Southwest Pacific, will have a particular interest in closer economic relations with her nearer neigh-

¹ See speech of Sir Earle Page, Minister of Commerce, Washington, July 10, 1942. (Australian Information Service, N.Y.C.)

² The treaty between the United States and China, signed January 11, 1943, provides for the relinquishment of extraterritorial jurisdiction and other special rights upon entry into force of the treaty. (*D. S. Bul.*, VIII, p. 59.) The United Kingdom has signed a similar treaty.

hors For some years past, Japan has propagated the notion of a co-prosperity sphere. But, ever since 1931, and increasingly so since she commenced to exploit the newly-occupied areas in Malaya, the Philippines and the East Indies, it has become plain that the so-called co-prosperity sphere means only this — that Japan is to get the prosperity while the subject peoples get a lower standard of living and the status of serfs or slaves.

In the post-war world the reorganization of these regions cannot be the Japanese system. We are now fighting to end that system. Moreover, our post-war order in the Pacific cannot be for the sole benefit of one power or group of powers. Its dominant purpose must be that of benefiting the peoples everywhere. If "freedom from want" means anything, it means that the age of unfair exploitation is over. If the attainment of a higher and better standard of life for all the Pacific peoples involves any changes in forms of government or administration, either as a means of progress or as a consequence of it, the United Nations must be ready to make the necessary changes. In short, we must found future Pacific policy on the doctrine of trusteeship for the benefit of all the Pacific peoples. That doctrine the Commonwealth has endeavored to carry out in New Guinea under the Mandates system of the League of Nations. Japan's record as a Mandatory power only proves that a solemn trust can be betrayed.

Australia, *C.N.I.A.*, XIII, 1942, p. 55-62.

***Herbert V. Evatt, Attorney-General and Minister for External Affairs:
Statement on War Aims and Reconstruction before the House of
Representatives Made on Introduction of Bill to Alter the Constitu-
tion, October 1, 1942***

When the war is over, Australia will be confronted with the greatest task of economic rehabilitation in her history. Problems of employment, of housing, of health and child welfare, of vocational training, of markets and price stability will call for enterprise and statecraft of the highest order. The whole history of the Commonwealth Constitution shows that these problems cannot be solved without wider powers in the hands of the central Government. . . .

. . . Events have proved that the constitution which the Australian people adopted in 1900 is flexible enough for the needs of war. But it is equally true that it is not flexible enough to serve Australia in the great task of post-war reorganization which the declared war aims of the United Nations will involve. . . .

. . . This country, like all the other United Nations, has pledged itself to the task of achieving the broad objectives embodied in the Atlantic Charter and in the historic declaration of the four essential human freedoms — freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear — anywhere and everywhere in the world. These declarations are not legal instruments, technically binding on Australia. But they are far more. They are solemn pledges of our dedication as a nation to the great ends of economic security, social justice and individual freedom. Do we intend to carry out these pledges? The answer is “Yes, we must.” If so, the Australian nation which is pledged as a nation must be endowed as a nation with legislative powers to carry out the pledges within Australia and its territories.

For these reasons we should ask the people to grant us power to carry out the war aims and objects of the United Nations. It may be said that any elaborate discussion of constitutional changes will divert energy and attention from the war effort. If this contention is sound, it should be upheld. But it is unsound for two distinct reasons. First, it is becoming more and more clear that the military overthrow of our enemies, although our primary aim, will in no way be obstructed, but will be assisted if positive plans are now laid as to the course to be pursued in the post-war period. It is an important part of the war effort itself that some plan of economic and social justice shall now be prepared as some guarantee to the men and women of Australia that their self-sacrifice will not have been in vain. I cannot sum up this better than by quoting from a recent speech of John Winant, American Ambassador to Britain, who on June 8, speaking to the Durham miners, said: —

To crush Fascism at its roots we must crush Depression. We must solemnly resolve that in our future order we will not tolerate the economic evils which breed poverty and war. This is not something that we shelve “for the duration”; it is part of the war.

Second, it is plain that, if no action is taken until the war is over, it will then be too late. The problems arising on the termination of hostilities will require action as dramatic and as urgent as the war itself. But the constitution amending process takes some time, and a great constitutional change should never be carried out without careful consideration. We should prepare for the task now. Later may be too late.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 240-1; Australia, *C.N.I.A.*, XIII, p. 119-24.

Annex

TEXT OF A BILL TO ALTER THE CONSTITUTION, OCTOBER 1, 1942

Be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, with the approval of the electors as required by the Constitution, as follows:—

1. This Act may be cited as Constitution Alteration (War Aims and Reconstruction), 1942.

2. The Constitution is altered by inserting in Chapter I after Part V the following Part and section:—

“Part VI. — War Aims and Post-War Reconstruction.

“60A. — (1) The Parliament shall have full power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth, its territories and all places under its jurisdiction or control, for the purpose of carrying into effect the war aims and objects of Australia as one of the United Nations, including the attainment of economic security and social justice in the post-war world and for the purpose of post-war world and for the purpose of post-war reconstruction generally.

“(2) Without limiting the generality of the foregoing sub-section, it is hereby declared that the power of the Parliament shall extend to all measures which in the declared opinion of the Parliament will tend to achieve economic security and social justice, including security of employment and the provision of useful occupation for all the people, and shall include power to make laws with respect to—

(a) the reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the fighting services of the Commonwealth during the war and of the dependents of such members who have died or been disabled as a consequence of the war;

(b) employment, including the transfer of workers from war-time industries;

(c) the development of the country and the expansion of production and markets;

(d) the production and manufacture of goods and the supply of goods and services, and the establishment and development of industries;

(e) prices of goods and services, including their regulation and control;

(f) profiteering;

(g) the encouragement of population;

(h) carrying into effect the guarantee of the four freedoms, that is to say—

(i) freedom of speech and expression;

(ii) religious freedom;

(iii) freedom from want; and

(iv) freedom from fear;

(i) national works and services, including water conservation, and irrigation, afforestation and the protection of the soil;

(j) the improvement of living standards in both rural and urban areas;

(k) transport, including air transport;

(l) national health and fitness;

(m) the housing of the people; and

(n) child welfare.

"(3) All the powers conferred upon the Parliament by this section may be exercised notwithstanding anything contained elsewhere in this Constitution or in the Constitution of any State and may be exercised as on and from a date to be proclaimed by the Governor-General in Council."

Australia, *C.N.I. A.*, XIII, p. 119; *I-A R.*, 1942, II, p. 240-41.

C. New Zealand

A Labor Cabinet has been in office since December 5, 1935. It was reorganized on April 30, 1940 and again in January 1941. Peter Fraser was Acting Prime Minister at the outbreak of war due to the ill-health of Prime Minister Savage.

1939

- Sept. 3 Declaration of state of war with Germany.
- " 5 Parliament unanimously approved the state of war with Germany.

1940

- Apr. 30 Peter Fraser became Prime Minister
- Jun. 11 Declaration of state of war with Italy

1941

- Dec. 7 Declarations of state of war with Finland, with Hungary, and with Rumania.
- " 9 Declaration of state of war with Japan.

1942

- Feb. 16 Direct diplomatic representation established in Washington
- Jul. The Prime Minister announced a National War Administration and the War Cabinet was increased to thirteen, six of whom were oppositionists.
- Sept. 3 Exchange of notes on reciprocal lend-lease aid with the United States. Adherence to the principles of master agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States, signed February 23, 1942.
- Oct. 1 Four oppositionists resigned from the War Cabinet and their duties were taken over by the remaining two.
- Nov. 30 Breaking off of diplomatic relations with the Vichy Government.

Michael J. Savage, Prime Minister: Broadcast from Wellington, September 5, 1939

. . . The war is not against the German people but against Nazi domination. Not a moment too soon have Britain and France taken arms against so faithless and unscrupulous an adversary. We are fighting a doctrine that springs from contempt for human nature and disregards the rights of people. Nowhere is the issue better understood than in New Zealand, where liberty has been enjoyed for a century behind the sure shield of Britain. . . . Both with gratitude for the past and with confidence for the future, we range ourselves without fear beside Britain. Where she goes, we go; where she stands, we stand. We are only a small,

young nation, but we are one and all a band of brothers, and we march forward with a union of hearts and wills to a common destiny.

New Zealand's War Effort, Wellington, 1941;
The Times, September 6, 1939, p. 6.

Peter Fraser, Prime Minister: Message to the United Kingdom Government on Italy's Entry into the War, June 11, 1940

New Zealand renews her assurances of all possible assistance until the menace of ruthless and unprincipled aggression is destroyed.

The Times, June 12, 1940, p. 5.

House of Representatives: Resolution, September 3, 1940

On the occasion of the anniversary of the declaration of war against Nazi Germany this House, in the name and on behalf of the people of New Zealand, records its firm and unswerving devotion to the cause of freedom, democracy, and Christian civilization for which the British Commonwealth took up arms, and its inflexible resolution to do all that lies in its power to the utmost limits of the Dominion's resources to contribute towards the decisive defeat of the enemy, the overthrow of the Nazi and Fascist tyranny, and the establishment of a lasting peace based on justice to all peoples concerned.

The Times, September 4, 1940, p. 3.

Walter Nash, Deputy Prime Minister¹ and Minister to the United States: Broadcast from Washington, April 26, 1942

. . . The foundations of our post-war world must be firm enough and permanent enough to ensure the production of more and better goods — more and better services — greater leisure — greater security — greater opportunity for a full and useful life for one and all.

It is our responsibility to see that in the future our economic affairs are so ordered as to guarantee the availability of the good things that are produced to all men of all nations — not merely to a few favored nations — not merely to a few favored individuals — but to all men and all women of all countries.

These objectives will be achieved if we agree that a first charge on all wealth created after the war must be the care of those who fought and worked and sacrificed to win the war — of the aged who have done their

¹ While serving as minister to the United States, Mr Nash retains his position as Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance

share in making our present life possible — of the young whose duty and privilege it will be to make a still better world in the future — of the ailing because they cannot care for themselves — and last, but not least, of those who work with hand or brain — transforming the world's natural resources into the necessities and amenities on which society depends — because to them should be assured the full reward of their toil after those who are unable to care for themselves have been provided for.

God sent people into this world to work for themselves and for each other and not to be slaves. We in New Zealand are fighting so that we may be free and equal citizens in a world society. We do not want to become slaves in a Nazi or Japanese new order and no sacrifice on our part will be considered too great to save us and others from such a future.

Release from New Zealand Legation, Washington.

*Walter Nash, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister to the United States: Address at Camp Tamiment, Pennsylvania, June 28, 1942*¹

My purpose in contributing to this discussion on "Freedom" is to advocate the establishment *now* of international and regional machinery designed to secure greater unity and coordination and a more vigorous offensive both in the prosecution of the war and in the no less urgent and important task of preparing a working basis for post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction. We are making a fatal mistake, I believe, if we look upon these two purposes as separate and distinct — to be pursued independently — first the one and then the other. Rather should they be considered as essentially interdependent — as two phases of the one objective — to be pursued together and with equally firm resolve. Because if we win the war with no plans but a return to normalcy — if we make the mistake that we made last time of leaving the peace to look after itself — then we will assuredly be setting the stage for another war — perhaps within another generation.

There are hundreds of subjects that will require investigation and innumerable problems for which we will have to find a solution if the pledges we have given are to be honored. To mention only a few there is the problem of wide disparities in living standards both within and between the nations; the problem of ensuring access, on equal terms, to the trade and raw material resources of the world; problems associated with the provision of adequate shipping and other transport facilities; with the

¹ See also his addresses at Chicago, June 11, 1942 and at Charlottesville, Va., July 11, 1942 (Releases from New Zealand Legation, Washington).

overcoming of racial prejudices and particularly of the idea held by many peoples of their inherent superiority over others; with the breaking down of migration barriers; with the question of miscegenation; problems of territorial adjustments and the determination of national boundaries; of minority rights and freedom; of the control of colonial territories; of the regulation of international investments and investment policy.

The solution of most of these and the other pressing problems with which the world is confronted today and will be confronted still more critically tomorrow, is, I believe, to be found in the answers to the following questions:

(1) Can the resources of the world be so organized as to ensure the availability to all peoples of those commodities and services and that environment which will enable them to develop to the maximum, physically, mentally and culturally?

(2) If it is possible so to organize the world's resources, are the people of the United States, Great Britain and the other United Nations, determined that this tremendous job of organization shall be honestly and courageously attempted?

(3) If the answers to the two preceding questions are in the affirmative then what positive steps are necessary to achieve the objective agreed upon? . . .

President Roosevelt's declaration of the Four Freedoms; Vice President Wallace's challenging assertion that this must be the century of the common man — Sumner Welles' affirmation and proposals — these statements of policy and objectives, backed up by the Eight Principles of the Atlantic Charter, are excellent — magnificent — but so far they are only *words*.

If we want the world of the future to be free of war (and freedom will not — cannot — come through the dominance of any one nation or group of nations) — we must get on with the job of preparing for freedom now.

How can living standards be raised the world over? How can we guarantee to the common people of the world, when the war has been won, the availability of more and better goods and services — greater security — greater leisure — greater opportunities for a fuller and freer life for one and all? How can we commence the job of lifting standards and adjusting living relations for the people of India — of China — of Africa — of Latin America — of the impoverished nations of Europe — of submerged classes in the United States — in Britain — in every country?

The problems are so vast that they appear insoluble. Yet to survive, we must think out the steps. Here is one suggestion.

On present evidence, it seems clear that neither the United States, Russia, China, the British Commonwealth — or any other of the United Nations, can win the war on their own; but they *can* win it together. If only together they can win the war, why not get together now? Why not a World War Council and a World Military Council with representatives of Russia — China — The United States — the British Commonwealth and with provision for India to be represented if and when she lends her full support to the fight against Axis domination. Subsidiary to the World War Council, there might be representative regional Councils similar to the present Pacific War Council whose responsibility it would be to take charge of each theatre of war after the general over-all strategy had been determined by the World Council.

The production, assignment and control of all munitions and equipment would, under the scheme envisaged, be left to a World Military Council whose responsibility would embrace all operational and tactical decisions.

This procedure should result in (1) a World War Council to determine major policy; (2) a World Military Council to determine tactics and operations in line with the general policy laid down by the World War Council; (3) Regional War Councils composed of representatives of those nations vitally concerned in each major theatre of war and functioning as the Pacific War Council at present functions; (4) Production and Assignment Councils entirely subject to the direction of the World Military Council responsible for seeing to the production of munitions and equipment and their allocation to the various theatres of war, in accordance with strategic and operational requirements.

Munitions and equipment, once assigned and despatched to a particular theatre of war would, at that point, come under the control of the Military Authorities in that theatre.

These few ideas are intended only to indicate the kind of practical measures which the Anti-Axis Allies can and should take, without delay, in the interests of more complete and more effective unity in their fight for victory over the enemies of freedom.

Tremendously urgent and essential though it is that our military effort should be a completely united effort in terms of strategy, production and operational controls, this plea for unity goes much further. It is a plea that the unity which is evolved painfully on the field of battle should be carried over with no interruption — but, if possible, strengthened and reinvigorated, into the era of peace. This will demand on our

part full and unfailing acceptance of a positive — no less than a negative — purpose in the unity we seek — of a tremendous constructive no less than a tremendous destructive effort, to which we must devote our collective mental, moral and physical resources now and for many years to come. It will demand, on our part, a readiness to work together in the task of elaborating a common program for post-war reconstruction no less than in the task of evolving a common strategy for defeating the enemy.

The linking up of all peoples who are fighting for freedom must, therefore, be accompanied by the establishment of parallel machinery and procedures by which a positive program can be mapped out for carrying on a world at peace. To this end, I suggest the setting up *now* of a World Reconstruction and Development Council with subsidiary Councils organized on a regional basis.¹

Briefly stated, the job of these Reconstruction and Development Councils would be to work out peace logistics — to readjust stock positions — to deal with the problem of surpluses after the war — arrange for the continuance of a world lend-lease procedure that will enable plant, equipment and raw materials to be transferred to countries where the need is greatest, — and generally to see that commodities and production facilities are made available according to capacity to produce on the one hand, and relative need, on the other.

Care will have to be exercised to ensure that the powers and authority vested in the World Reconstruction and Development Council and its subsidiary bodies does not conflict with or limit in any essential respect, the complete freedom of the War and Military Councils to take any action they consider necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. Subject to this important qualification, however, the principle should be accepted that the Reconstruction and Development Councils ought to possess the same authority and power in their particular sphere of responsibility, as it is proposed to give the War Councils in the sphere of war activities.

It is inevitable, of course, that while the war lasts, reconstruction and developmental work will be confined, in the main, to preparation of plans and working out of procedures so that as soon as the time arrives the transition from war to peace can be effected smoothly and with a minimum of disturbance and distress. The job of assembling the necessary data — of finding a basis of common action — of formulating specific proposals — this, in itself is likely to tax the ingenuity of the wisest men and women. We cannot start too soon.

¹ See also his speech at London, Aug 13, 1942 (Release from New Zealand Legation).

The first step will be to determine our objectives, which must be in full accord with the principles of the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter; I suggest that this reconstruction and development objective should be: —

(1) To maximize production of what could reasonably be defined as essential commodities. (This might mean the provision of productive equipment in addition to consumable goods.)

(2) To assign these essential commodities and equipment in the post-war period to those places where they will satisfy urgent physical needs and foster productive development.

These assignments should be determined by the same rules as now govern the decisions of War Councils. In brief, they should go where they will give the best results — results, however, measured not in terms of military strategic advantage but in terms of economic and social welfare.

When the definite objectives have been determined and agreed upon it will be the responsibility of the regional Reconstruction and Development Councils to carry out these objectives — subject, of course, to the general direction and broad policy decisions of the World Council.

To summarize the immediate steps required in order that we may ultimately reach the objectives stated, there should be set up:

1. A World War Council representative of say — Russia — China — the United States and the British Commonwealth — plus India if she joins fully in the fight for freedom. This Council will determine the major policy and strategy of the war.

2. A World Military Council to control tactical and operational work in accord with policy and major strategy as determined by the World War Council — with Production and Assignment Councils acting under instructions of the Military Council.

3. Councils similar to the Pacific War Council on which each country in any particular theatre of war would be represented and which would, under the authority of and subject to, the World War Council, take charge of each particular theatre.

4. A Military Council for each Theatre of War subject to the World Military Council — with complete autonomy for the Supreme Commander in each particular theatre — for all tactical and operational work.

5. A World Reconstruction and Development Council charged with giving effect to measures that will

(a) maximize production of essential commodities and services

(b) ensure the assignment of materials — commodities and equipment and technical assistance to the countries where the need is greatest.

6. Subsidiary Regional Reconstruction and Development Councils representative of particular countries charged with giving effect to measures determined on by the World Reconstruction and Development Council.

These are rough outlines only — but they are given to stimulate discussion and to bring action in order to determine what principles we must work to and whether these principles are moral in their origin and practicable in application. . . .

Release from the New Zealand Legation, Washington.

*Walter Nash, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister to the United States:
Speech before the International Students Assembly, Washington,
September 3, 1942*

. . . For the military struggle, then, we are ready and confident. Are we equally ready and confident that having defeated the Axis, we shall have succeeded in safeguarding and extending, directly and indirectly, the application of the Four Freedoms of the principles of the Atlantic Charter — to the peoples of all lands, without discrimination in race or color or creed? Are we completely satisfied that the war we are fighting for Democracy and Freedom will not end in their destruction? Are we completely satisfied that in winning the war we will not discover, too late, as we discovered last time that we have lost the peace? Do we really mean to reconstruct the world on the pattern of those ideals that we subscribe to? Are we prepared and willing to make those readjustments nationally and internationally, which alone can furnish a foundation for a just and enduring peace? Or are we merely to regard the promises of the Atlantic Charter for example as pious maxims to be discarded and forgotten when victory comes?

On our answers to these questions everything depends. Nor can we postpone our decision. It must be made now. We must decide now because the nature of our post-war settlement will necessarily be influenced by the conditions we create during the war itself. We must decide now because whatever we want the character of our post-war world to be, one thing is certain — it will not wait upon events. Because we can only have one aim — the progressive and continuous realization of our ideals so that what is begun painfully on the field of battle is carried over with no interruption but increased momentum into the era of peace. We must decide now because if at the close of this war we permit a sense of frustration and disillusionment to develop, the stage will most assuredly be set for a further bloody conflict — perhaps within another

generation. And is not the possibility that such a calamity may visit civilization once more enough to make us think now, even when our very existence is threatened, in more than vague, general terms, of a new true order of liberty?

The principles for which we are fighting — the principles set out in the Four Freedoms and in the Atlantic Charter — will need much more thorough elaboration in terms of practical politics before we can proceed very far towards their fulfillment.

But whether we succeed or fail in our military struggle — whether or not we emerge from this war into a people's century it is quite certain that there can be no return to the world we knew just three short years ago. Any attempt to put the clock back is foredoomed to failure . . . We must accept the fact that we have been thrust into a revolutionary epoch. We must aim to guide that revolution along channels that will enable ordinary men and women everywhere to live better and fuller lives than at any time in the past. We must rid ourselves once and for all of the imperialist idea — the idea that any individual — group of individuals — that any nation or group of nations should be allowed to exercise political or economic domination over others.

It is, I believe, no rash prophecy to say that one inevitable consequence of the war itself will be the liquidation of the last remaining legacies of imperialism so far as the more advanced peoples of the Orient are concerned. It is inconceivable that the system of extraterritoriality, the foreign concessions and other privileges which were enjoyed by the so-called imperialist powers in the Orient will survive a victorious outcome of China's heroic struggle against Japanese aggression. China has been admitted to the family of Free Nations as a full and equal partner — as such her destiny will be completely in her own hands. She will never again accept, nor will she be expected to accept, her former semi-colonial status.

In the case of other backward countries and colonial territories whose people have not achieved that degree of unity and political organization necessary for stable and responsible self-government, some form of protection will need to be afforded them. It would be foolish, therefore, to propose that such peoples should be left entirely to their own devices. But international machinery will need to be devised and adequate guarantees given that the administration of such territories will be carried out with a spirit of trusteeship and not, as so often in the past, with a view to their exploitation for the benefit of nationals of a single power. The sole consideration must be the well-being, education and development of the native inhabitants and their training in every possible way

in the responsibility of government. Equality of economic opportunity and equal access to the raw material resources of colonial mandated territories must prevail, subject always to the paramount interests of the native inhabitants. But we must do more than devise new machinery and new methods of administration. If we are honestly determined to banish once and for all the imperialist idea and all it means, we must rid ourselves of the prejudices in which it has such fertile roots. We must rid ourselves of the idea that there exists, or can exist, an inherently superior person — superior nation — or superior race.

We must realize that there is something wrong with a world in which nations counting their people by the hundred millions, have such low living standards that their progressive development either physically, mentally or culturally, is rendered almost impossible; and yet from whose impoverished resources material tribute is paid to other nations much more fortunately placed and with infinitely higher living standards.

We must realize that the same principle is involved and a similar injustice committed, when individuals are compelled to work and to exist on low living standards, while any portion of the fruits of their labor benefits other individuals who, though able to work, live easy, comfortable lives without fear of poverty and lacking neither physical commodities nor personal services.

In order to be sure that the freedom we win is a freedom in which *all* will share, we must reorientate the principles that give title to the world's resources and raw materials — to the goods and services which are or can be made available to satisfy human needs. This, admittedly, will take much working out; but whatever difficulties it may present, the need for working it out — above all, the need for making a start *now* and not when the war has finished — is none the less essential, if freedom for ourselves and for our children is to be assured.

We must realize too that the artificially nurtured emotion of nationalism and the fetish of sovereignty from which it springs must give way to a larger sense of human brotherhood. It is far easier to appeal to prejudice and emotion than to reason but unless reason is to prevail over the exclusive sovereignty of the national state there can be no firm and lasting foundation for a stable peace. We must realize above all that freedom and progress go hand in hand. The story of the world's progress is the story of men's march towards an ever-widening freedom. The negation of freedom is dictatorship, and dictatorship is the logical outcome of a social order which has lost its power to promote the welfare of the masses.

Whether the conclusion of this war will mark the end of one era and

the beginning of another — the end of imperialism and the beginning of a Century of the common man — will depend very largely upon our capacity to so organize our affairs as to guarantee to all men greater security — greater opportunity — a fuller and happier life than heretofore.

Whether they belong to the “backward” races of the world — whether they are “colonial” peoples — whether they constitute submerged minorities on terms of social and political inequality with other nationals — whether they are members of populous but impoverished nations such as China or India — whatever their political status — their culture — their material advancement — there is inherent in them all special abilities and qualities of leadership which, given an opportunity to develop — given a chance of full and free expression — can add tremendously to the world’s well-being.

To ensure that all races have this opportunity — and have it they must, if their role in our future civilization is to be a fruitful and a happy one — it will be necessary for many of us to foresake the prejudices we have cultivated — to revise the attitudes we have acquired — to get rid of that suggestion of smugness and superiority of which we have been guilty — to realize that the day of the white man’s burden-carrying is definitely over.

We must realize that there cannot for ever exist side by side, either within the one country or within different countries, widely varying standards.

We must aim to lift the standards of these groups within the community or of those nations which are today unduly depressed. This will involve a relaxation and removal of many barriers that have grown up — it may involve the giving up of certain advantages which some of us, more fortunately placed than others, have come to regard as our special rights and privileges.

But unless we are prepared and willing to make these concessions, we must accept the alternative, and the alternative, as I see it, is renewed sectional strife — renewed racial hatreds — renewed fears and suspicions between the nations — in which the seeds of war and tragedy will once again be sown.

I believe that we must give evidence of the sincerity of our intentions — now and as the war proceeds. We should not be unduly distressed if some of the “subject” peoples of the world to whom we may not always have shown the consideration that should have been shown — are a little reluctant to accept our assurances given in the Atlantic Charter for example — at their face value. If, however, we can by our example,

show these people and others — that we mean what we say — that the policy we have proclaimed is not based on considerations of expediency but on those of principle — if we can somehow persuade the oppressed men and women of Europe — of Japanese-dominated Asia — of submerged groups and racial minorities everywhere — not excluding our own countries — if we can bring to the common people the world over a conviction that our cause is their cause — that our pledge is to secure for all men and all women, peace with plenty; freedom with security; justice with equality — then we shall indeed have achieved a great deal — then may we say with full confidence that the age of imperialism has ended.

Release from New Zealand Legation, Washington.

Walter Nash, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister to the United States: Speech on "Imperatives for Peace," to the World Confederation of International Groupments,¹ New York City, December 4, 1942

The world today is facing at the immediate moment three grave dangers: One is the loss of the war. The second is the non-understanding of war aims. The third is divergent war aims of the United Nations.

Recent events have shown that victory when it comes may not come rapidly, but will almost certainly come suddenly. . . . We must, therefore, be sure that when that victory comes we have in readiness if not a completed blueprint of the world of the future, at least plans for the establishment and functioning of councils and organizations whose responsibility it will be to draw up those blueprints. If I may extend this comparison, we want to have the machine tools ready for the construction of the peace and we want to have them ready in the very near future. . . .

. . . The first essential condition for a peaceful world order after this war is that Russia and China should be parties to all agreements and discussions concerning post-war arrangements from the time such agreements or discussions are initiated. We should not go to them and pre-

¹ This organization came into being in 1942 following the setting up of a provisional committee composed of representatives of the Federation of World Cooperation, the International Library presided over by Edouard Herriot, the International Peace Campaign presided over by Lord Cecil and Pierre Cot, the Free World Association presided over by Mrs. J. B. Harriman, the International League of Human Rights presided over by Henry Laugier, Federal Union Inc., presided over by Clarence Streit, and a number of other international organizations.

sent a combined Anglo-American plan and say this is what we think — take it or leave it. Anything of that nature must tend to arouse their antagonism and their suspicion. All four of these major powers among the United Nations must sit down at any conference table as equals. I am not for a moment suggesting that the Big Four should have the exclusive right of determining the peace. All the United Nations must have a voice when the time comes. I am suggesting, however, that no peace will be practicable unless these four chief powers are in agreement, and we will get that agreement far more rapidly and far more easily if we cast out of our minds our old prejudices and suspicions and sit down as equals as soon as possible to work out the main lines of the post-war world. . . .

One sphere in which misunderstanding and suspicion can very easily arise is, of course, in the relations between Russia on the one hand, and Great Britain and America on the other. There still exists in many minds suspicions about the Russian Government which must be removed entirely before any satisfactory peace can be constructed. We should give very serious and careful consideration to all the statements and proposals which the Russians put forward because I think such consideration can do a great deal to remove suspicions.

Let us look for one moment at the question of war aims. The Russians have signified their adherence to the United Nations' declaration which reaffirms the principles of the Atlantic Charter. This general support of the principles of the Atlantic Charter has been reiterated recently by no other person than Stalin himself in his speech of November 6,¹ . . . they (these points) constitute a complete underlining of the main declarations of the Atlantic Charter.

. . . the relations with Russia . . . seem to me to be the core of one of the main problems of the post-war settlement. There is another matter, however, which I think is also of great importance. There should be complete understanding in this country as to the true nature of the British Commonwealth and that there should be complete understanding in the British Commonwealth as to the true nature of the United States and the other American Republics.

. . . We in New Zealand came into the war entirely of our own free will. We have raised our own voice with complete frankness regarding the conduct of the war, whenever we thought fit. We have taken no orders from England and at no time has anyone attempted to give such orders. We are, I stress this again, an independent nation. But while we are intensely proud of that independence we are also proud to belong

¹ See p. 371.

to a bigger unit because we have found that membership of that bigger unit of the British Commonwealth of Nations has given us opportunities for development, has given us access to culture, literature and ideas which we have not the resources or the population yet to develop in our own small country. For that reason we see in the British Commonwealth of Nations a principle which should not be destroyed, but should rather be extended so that a similar relationship can be established between other independent countries in the world and into which the present colonial, and less developed areas can be admitted one by one as they come to adult nationhood. Of these areas I would say India will be one of the first to be admitted to that full freedom the moment the war finishes. She has been promised freedom and I believe she will get it. But that must not interfere with military needs of the present. Winning the war must be the first thing, though we must always keep in mind the paths we propose to travel when peacetime comes.

I conclude, therefore, by stressing these three main points. . . . One is that Russia and China as the two other major powers, along with Britain and the United States, among the United countries, should be notified of all discussions of post-war agreements at the start of those discussions and that each of these countries, Russia, China, Great Britain and America should meet as equals. The second point is that we should do everything possible to break down the suspicion of Russia that exists on our side of the barrier and the suspicion of us that exists on the Russian side. The third point is that we should clear up one of the possible grounds of misunderstanding between Great Britain and other United Nations by encouraging a close examination of what the British Commonwealth of Nations really is and what its institutions really are, despite the fact they may bear the title "Imperial" or "Empire" or any other such description.

The strategy of victory, to me, must be formed of a United war strategy, and a United peace strategy. All should be in the war strategy to determine and to act. So must the strategy for post-war be a United strategy. It cannot bring peace if it is not. The Superior people idea must go forever. Suspicion must go. We can build a better world. We are using the lives and bodies of our young people to make a new world possible. We will betray them, we will betray those who have fought for freedom in the past, we will betray the children of this generation and the children of their children unless we determine now the materials we will use in the foundations of the future. But we must always build such a foundation and such a structure that all men and all women, of whatever color, whatever creed, whatever class or whatever language they

may speak, shall have an opportunity to live the abundant life rendered possible by the creator of all good things.

Release from New Zealand Legation, Washington.

D. Union of South Africa

The United Party Cabinet, in office at the outbreak of war, broke up on September 5, 1939, when Prime Minister Hertzog proposed to Parliament a modified form of neutrality. Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Deputy Prime Minister, opposed this motion with the result that it was defeated. A dissolution having been refused, Field Marshal Smuts formed a new Cabinet on September 6, 1939, composed of the Smuts group of the United Party, the Dominion Party and the Labor Party.

1939

Sept. 6 Declaration of state of war with Germany.

1940

Jun. 11 Declaration of state of war with Italy.

1941

Dec. 8 Declaration of state of war with Finland, Japan, Rumania, and Hungary.

" 13 Declaration of state of war with Bulgaria.

1942

Jan. 25 Declaration of state of war with Thailand.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Speech to the House of Assembly, September 7, 1939

The House, which was free to have decided otherwise, takes a stand for the defense of freedom and the destruction of Hitlerism and all it implies. The interests of South Africa, however, are our primary concern. It was for the interests of South Africa that Parliament freely decided we should sever our relations with Germany. Thus we pledge our moral support for a common cause. . . .

In common with her friends and Allies, the Union has no quarrel with the German people as such. Its aim is to assist in the destruction of a system which is seeking to impose on the world a domination of violence and force in international affairs — a system which, as the facts of the past two years have proved, knows no respect for good faith between nations, which does not hesitate to dishonor its plighted word, if convenient to do so, and which threatens the liberty of every State throughout the world.

The Times, September 8, 1939, p. 7.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Speech on the Pan African Idea, Johannesburg, March 3, 1940

More and more the countries north of us are looking to us for guidance in various directions, especially in matters of mining and agriculture, because they are naturally anxious to benefit from our riper and more varied experience. We, on the other hand, have much to learn from our neighbors, and we have much to gain from contact with them.

More and more it is being realized that we have to work out an African viewpoint not only in agriculture, but also in many other directions.

Our schools and universities might do much to encourage the study of these countries — the languages, the conditions and the requirements of the peoples north of us . . .

. . . Now is the time for us to readjust our outlook on African affairs and to develop a new conception of our relations with our neighbors. We must demonstrate and bring home to all where our community of interests lies, and we must broaden very much the basis of our cooperation with other African States.

We cannot stand aloof, we of this richly endowed South Africa. If we wish to take our rightful place as leader in Pan African development and in the shaping of future policies and events in this vast continent, we must face the realities and facts of the present and seize the opportunity which these offer.

Legation of the Union of South Africa, Washington.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Broadcast to the People of Britain and the United States, July 21, 1940

From this distance I speak to you about war — a war of freedom if ever there was one, a war in which the fundamental question is whether freedom shall prevail or shall perish from the face of the earth before the most gigantic and diabolic onslaught that has ever been made against it. . . .

This brings me to my second point — the kind of peace we envisage and hope to establish at the end of this titanic struggle. Our vision still is freedom, the liberation of Europe from the deadly Nazi thrall, and its organization in new creative freedom. Perhaps the position could best be indicated by contrasting it with the sort of world order which Hitler is aiming at, and which he will probably yet proclaim in a great peace offensive. . . .

. . . It will be a new mechanized Europe, with some of the forms but none of the substance of freedom — a Europe in which units will be held together by central controls of Nazi ideology and Nazi economics, with the mailed fist in the background.

Real freedom, personal or national, will have perished. The principles of freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press which have been the guiding ideals of the West will have been effectively suppressed. The name of a Monroe Doctrine for this Europe will be invoked, but it will be a mere mockery and travesty of that Monroe Doctrine of America which is a bulwark of free national self-development for the whole continent.

This, in essence, will be the Hitler plan. . . . It will be the negation of what the human spirit, the free human soul, has stood for through long ages and looked forward to as its inspiring ideal. The vision which has guided our long slow advance will have perished in utter darkness and defeat.

As against this spectre of a Nazi-dominated Europe we oppose the vision of a truly free Europe. Freedom still remains our sovereign remedy for the ills from which human society is suffering. We envisage a free Europe, free for the individual and for the nation, free in the sense of giving full scope for personal and national self-development and self-perfection, each according to his own individual lines. In that fundamental sense we continue on the historic trail of human progress. But we have also learned that discipline and organization must go hand-in-hand with freedom. The failure of the League of Nations was largely due to the absence of a central control which could harmonize the freedom of each with the proper functioning of the whole of the human society. We, therefore, aim at a society of nations which will supply this defect and which will possess a central organization equipped with the necessary authority and powers to supervise the common concerns of mankind. Intercourse between the nations will be free, and commerce, economics, and finance will be freed of all hampering restrictions and obstructions. As between man and man there shall be social justice; as between nation and nation there shall be the rule of law, the absence of force and violence, and the maintenance of peace. In such an international society there will be no place for self-appointed leaders and Führers. He who will be master shall be servant. Our aims and motto will be: A nation of free men and women. An international society of free nations . . .

The Times, July 22, 1940, p. 5.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Speech at Bloemfontein, December 3, 1940

We shall see that the independence and freedom for which our people have fought, and which they finally attained, shall not be jeopardized.

We shall ensure that the German heel is not placed on South Africa's neck. We want to take our part in upholding a free world and standing with those who have stood by us for generations. I have no doubt that when it is all over it will be generally admitted that South Africa in a vital moment of her history chose rightly, however difficult the choice may have been.

The Times, December 4, 1940, p. 3.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Speech to the United Party Congress of the Orange Free State at Bloemfontein, December 4, 1940

The conflict now going on in the world goes to the roots of human society and of those things we stand for and hold dear in life. I feel that if Hitler wins the war and Nazism becomes the world's creed, there will be a setback of a thousand years in human history. We have come to this country with a tradition and a destiny. We believe in the Christian principles handed down by our forefathers. What we are fighting for are spiritual things.

The Times, December 5, 1940, p. 3.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Report of Speech at Johannesburg, January 11, 1941

General Smuts, speaking at Johannesburg, declared that the task to which South Africa had dedicated herself was to free the African continent of the enemy right up to the Mediterranean. "This African continent of ours," he said, "must be rendered safe for the future young democratic communities which are setting up house in this continent."

B.I.N., 1941, XVIII, 2, p. 113.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Broadcast, "A Vision of the Future," Pretoria, June 12, 1941

. . . It seems to me that the day of the small independent sovereign state has passed. That is the sign of the times. In the absence of a mighty world organization the sad fate of the small independent states of Europe in our day is likely to be their fate more and more in the future. Hitler's victorious course so far has at least proved that much. Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great proved the same for the Hellenic world. The Greek City State of ancient history and the small independent nation-state of today were and are anachronisms in the circumstances of their respective times. We are unmistakably in for larger

groupings in that holistic process which fundamentally molds all life and all history. On this theme I could write a book, but here I must forbear. I need only point to what is actually happening today. Already the free democracies, representing the forward movement in our Western civilization, are grouping themselves together under the pressure of the times. That pressure is irresistibly forcing them together in a great world organization, the outlines and pattern of which we are already beginning to see more or less clearly. In this association there appear various degrees of affinity.

In the inner circle, which now forms the heart of the resistance to Hitler, is the British Commonwealth of Nations. I need not dilate on the particular links which associate this world-wide circle freely together, but their association is undoubtedly a precedent and a prototype for the larger world association now in the process of formation.

Closest to this inner circle of the British group is the United States of America, which has the same ethic of life and the same political philosophy. Both have, in addition, the strong link of a common language and literary culture. The two thus form a very natural group. An outer circle of free democracies is represented by the victims of Hitler, nearly all of which are now in alliance with the British group. A few other states would also fall naturally into this association, but I cannot here go into details.

Here we have a world-wide, more or less natural grouping, based on common ideals of government and welded together by common adversity or common danger. At the peace they would naturally form themselves together into a world society, under a distribution which would provide for effective action by the society in all important matters affecting future security and reform. In this way an efficiently functioning organ of the world community would arise, capable of binding the component nations in the paths of peace and ordered progress and arranging its relations with other states not members of the Association. This new world society would follow positive and constructive policies for the future and not concern itself particularly with the past and with penal or revengeful action towards old enemies. And in this way in due course the world may forget its bitter wrongs and once more move into paths of peace and friendly economic relations among the nations. The mistake of the League of Nations in attempting too wide and universal a membership on too loose and nebulous a basis of organization and duties would thus be avoided, and the association would grow practically out of existing friendships and affinities, and might expand later into the wider international society of the future. We

should not attempt to do at one stroke what could only be accomplished in a long process of time and experience.

The crux of this next great step in the organization of our world will be the attitude of the United States of America. . . . She has her share of responsibility for the past, and she has an even greater responsibility for the future. Her unique position in the world, her vital stake in the issues in dispute, the dangers which face her also in a world in chaos — in all these considerations place a heavy duty on her in this matter of world organization. Isolationism is as dead as the absolute sovereignty of the national state. Security, reform, better ordering of our world community — all call for an effective common authority. Thus only can our world be made reasonably safe for peace and liberty — the twin ideals of democracy.

In that common world authority America must play a leading part. The failure of the League since 1932 is probably the main cause of the present world war. America's sporadic efforts to help from the outside proved unavailing. As a Member of the League her role would probably have been decisive. I must therefore conclude that just as world organization is essential, so America's membership in such an organization is no less essential. She holds the key. Let her use it, and open the door through which the world can escape from chaos and suffering.

Such in brief outline is my vision of the future after the war. I may be asked what about the other states, our present enemies and those in league or in sympathy with them? Do I abandon them to outer darkness? Will there not then be the opening for rival groups which may sooner or later clash again?

I hope this possibility will be avoided by our avoiding all ideas of revenge and penal retribution for a past in whose mistakes we all have our share. Let us try to be helpful in spite of bitter memories. Especially let us give a helping hand in economic reconstruction. Let us thus quietly begin to pick up the threads of a common life again, and let time do its own healing work.

First and foremost we shall be called upon to put our own house in our own democratic circle in order, and insure as far as possible against the sort of dangers which have now twice overwhelmed us in one generation. Leave the rest to time, to the workings of ordinary prudence and sympathy and reviving generosity, and do not let us attempt more than is wisely possible for the immediate future after the war. Time is a real force, a great healer and a great builder. Let us leave it its place and its function in our vision of the future.

From the Legation of the Union of South Africa, Washington.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Report of Speech at Bloemfontein,¹ October 22, 1941

... he looked on the war as one of the great religious wars of the world; it was once more the historic fight which was fought out from age to age — the fight between light and darkness. It involved all the things man had struggled for through centuries — freedom of conscience and religion, freedom to shape one's own life and destiny; freedom to be the custodian of one's own soul. . . .

B.I.N., 1941, XVIII, 22, p. 1847-8.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Note to the Vichy Minister at Pretoria, Breaking Off Diplomatic Relations with France because of its Collaboration with the Axis, April 23, 1942

... We do not cease to cherish a firm faith in the resurrection of France, and we shall continue to labor and fight for the day when France will once more resume her proud place in the world and her proper role among the champions of the rights of man.

B.I.N., 1942, XIX, 9, p. 404

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Address to the Joint Session of the British Houses of Parliament, London, October 21, 1942²

... This, at bottom, is a war of the spirit, of man's soul. Hitler has tried to kill this spirit and to substitute for it some *ersatz* thing, something which is really its negation. . . .

... At bottom, therefore, this war is a new crusade, a new fight to the death for man's rights and liberties, and for the personal ideals of man's ethical and spiritual life.

To the Nazi fanaticism we oppose this crusading spirit, which will not sheath the sword till Nazidom and all its works have been purged from this fair world. And in that spirit the United Nations will march forward to victory and to the world which will follow that victory.

I therefore come to the question: What is the sort of world which we envisage as our objective after the war? What sort of social and international order are we aiming at? These are very important questions . . . if we mean not only to win the war but also the peace.

¹ See also his speech at Sonderwater Camp on July 14, 1940, quoted by Norton, Conrad and Krige, Uys, *Vanguard of Victory*, Pretoria, 1941.

² See also his international broadcast from London, October 31, 1942 (*N Y T*, November 1, 1942).

Our ideas of these matters 22 years ago were much too vague and crude, and at the same time much too ambitious, with the result that when they came to be tested by hard experience they proved wanting, and their failure helped to contribute to the present conflict. With that experience before us, we ought this time to hammer out something more clear, more definite and practical.

A great deal of thought is, no doubt, already being given to these matters, and one may hope that we shall approach the peace much better informed and equipped than we were last time.

Certain points of great importance have already emerged. Thus we accepted the name of "the United Nations." This is a new conception, much in advance of the old concept of a League of Nations.

We do not want a mere League, but something more definite and organic, even if — to begin with — more limited and less ambitious than the League. "The United Nations" is itself a fruitful conception, and on the basis of that conception practical machinery for the functioning of an international order could be explored.

Then again, we have the Atlantic Charter, in which certain large principles of international policy in the social and economic spheres have been accepted. That too marks a great step forward which only requires more careful definition and elaboration to become a real Magna Carta of the nations.

Again, we have agreed on certain large principles of social policy, involving social security for the citizen in matters which have lain at the roots of much social unrest and suffering in the past.

We cannot hope to establish a new heaven and a new earth in the bleak world which will follow after this most destructive conflict of history. But certain patent social and economic evils could be tackled on most practical lines, on an international scale almost at once.

Then again, we have accepted the principle of international help underlying the Mutual Aid Agreement¹ The helping hand in international life is thus already a matter of practical politics, and could be suitably extended after the war. This, too, is a far-reaching innovation, pointing the way to fruitful developments in future.

All these are already indications of considerable advances to a better world and a richer life for mankind. To these we may add much of the social and economic work of the League of Nations, which remains of permanent value.

Much of the League organization could continue to function for the

¹ See p. 10.

future well-being of mankind. In sober resolution, in modest hope, and strong faith, we move forward to the unknown future

There is no reason why we should not hopefully and sincerely attempt to carry out for the world the task which now confronts us as never before in the history of our race. An American statesman has called this the century of the plain man, the common people.

I feel that in this vast suffering through which our race is passing we are being carried to a deeper sense of social realities. We are passing beyond the ordinary politics and political shibboleths. ✓

It is no longer a case of Socialism or Communism or any of the other "isms" of the market place, but of achieving common justice and fair play for all. People are searching their own souls for the causes which have brought us to this pass. May it be our privilege to see that this suffering, this travail and search of man's spirit shall not be in vain.

Without feeding on illusions, without nursing the impossible, there is yet much in the common life of the people which can be remedied, much unnecessary inequality and privilege to be levelled away, and much commonsense opportunity to be erected as the common birthright and public atmosphere for all to enjoy as of right.

Health, housing, education, decent social amenities, provision against avoidable insecurities — all these simple goods and much more can be provided for all, and thus a common higher level of life achieved for all.

So between the nations, a new spirit of human solidarity can be cultivated, and economic conditions can be built up which will strike at the root causes of war, and thus lay deeper foundations for world peace.

With honesty and sincerity on our part, it is possible to make basic reforms both for national and international life which will give mankind a new chance of survival and of progress.

Let this program, by no means too ambitious, be our task, and let us now already, even in the midst of war, begin to prepare for it. And may Heaven's blessing rest on our work, in War and in Peace.

The Offensive Phase, Speech by Field Marshal Smuts, reprinted by *The Daily Telegraph*, London. Supplied by the Legation of the Union of South Africa, Washington.

Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister: Article on the British Colonial Empire, December 28, 1942

. . . Freedom is not a thing that can be imposed from without. It can only be created from within. Its very essence is that it is a free self-creation. It must be the free expression of India's own wise political soul.

Next to the winning of the war, the emancipation of India without internal disruption is today perhaps the greatest prize in the world. God give that India's peoples and their leaders may win this prize. God grant wisdom to experienced British statesmanship to help India out in this almost too heavy task before her. But in the last resort it is India's job and India's responsibility to herself and her future. . . .

. . . What of the future of the colonies after this war?

They grew up haphazard in the past. It was a mere matter of chance who among the competing nations happened to arrive first and first hoisted the flag. And their subsequent fate and rate of progress have depended largely on the qualities and the resources of the power to which they happened to belong. The question is how far they will fit into the new world that will emerge after the war. For it will in many important respects be a different world from that which the war overwhelmed. For one thing, it will be a world governed by the Atlantic Charter and similar international instruments, the world of international collaboration as distinct from the old competitive order, the world where colonies situated on the strategic routes of the world will become important items in the program of general security against war, the world of security bases for the United Nations, of controlled war materials and of equal supply of necessary raw materials for the economic needs of the world. I mention only a few matters obviously coming within the scope of the Atlantic Charter which will have a bearing on the future of colonies. Here too the *laissez-faire* policies of the past will have to make way for the necessary controls of the future. And to that extent the colonial individualism of the past will have to adjust itself to the collectivist requirements of general defense and security against war in the future.

I mention a few other points on the future of the colonies which appear to me important to consider.

In the first place, it would be unwise to disturb existing administrative relationship between mother countries and their colonies. Mother countries should remain exclusively responsible for the administration of their colonies and interference by others should be avoided.

In the second place, wherever possible, isolated colonies belonging to a mother country should be grouped into larger units both for more efficient and economical administration, and for larger-scale development policies common to all. Thus British colonies in the West Indies or in the Far East or on the African continent could be grouped with larger powers assigned to the group, and corresponding decrease of power exercised in London. Such a change, involving decentralization so far as

the mother country is concerned and centralization with larger powers so far as the colonies are concerned, would be a welcome advance in the direction of colonial freedom and responsibility, which is the general trend of colonial development.

As a further stimulus to the development of such an enlarged colonial unit, its general development policy should be entrusted to a council on which not only the British Government as the parent state but also the unit itself and any interested neighboring British Commonwealth, such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, could prove beneficial in the advance of their less-developed neighbors and colonial areas be enabled to make the best progress.

In the third place, there should be a system of regional grouping of colonies to whatever mother countries they happen to belong. Thus colonies in the West Indies or in the Far East or on the African continent could be grouped to whatever powers they may belong for purposes of ultimate control of defense or economic policy under the Atlantic Charter or for other purposes. While the mother countries will be exclusively responsible for the administration of their colonies, the ultimate control of general or common policy would come under a regional commission or council on which will be represented not only the mother countries but also others regionally interested for security or economic reasons. Thus the United States of America, although no colonial power, could be on the regional control council of the West Indies or of Africa or elsewhere. It appears to me essential that the United States of America should in the future have a direct say with the mother countries in the settlement of general colonial policies and some such organization as is here suggested that would give her the necessary status with the rights and responsibilities implied. I have no doubt that such a partnership of the United States of America in overhead colonial controls would be cordially welcomed so far as the British Commonwealth of Nations is concerned. . . .

Courtesy of *Life Magazine*, copyright, December 28, 1942,
p. 11-14.

IV. UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The Soviet Union is a one party state, with a representative form of organization controlled by the Communist Party. The Constitution of December 5, 1936, provided for a Supreme Council of the Union, and a Praesidium to act as an executive and directive body between its sessions. The Council of People's Commissars, composed of the heads of government departments, exercises the real direction in the country under its Chairman, Joseph Stalin, who is also People's Commissar for Defense and head of the National Defense Council as well as Secretary of the Communist Party.

1939

- Aug. 23 Non-aggression pact with Germany signed.
- Sept 16 Red Army invaded Poland
- " 28 Friendship treaty with Germany signed, resulting in the partition of Poland.
10-year mutual assistance pact with Estonia signed at Moscow giving the Soviet Union air and military bases
- Oct 5 10-year mutual assistance pact signed with Latvia at Moscow.
- " 6 Great Britain and France accept the occupation of eastern sections of Poland by the Soviet Union as necessary for its safety.
- " 10 15-year mutual assistance pact with Lithuania signed at Moscow.
- " 17 Negotiations broken off with Turkey
- Nov 3 The Polish territories occupied by the U.S.S.R. were incorporated in the White Russian and Ukrainian Soviet Republics.
- " 28 Non-aggression treaty with Finland denounced.
- " 30 Finland invaded by Red Army.

1940

- Mar. 12 Peace treaty and protocol with Finland signed at Moscow.
- Jun. 15 Red Army entered Lithuania.
- " 17 Agreement of Estonia and Latvia to free passage of Soviet troops and to formation of new governments announced.
- " 27 Cession of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina by Rumania to the U.S.S.R.
- Aug. 26 Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania ratified incorporation in the U.S.S.R.

1941

- Jan. 10 Agreements with Germany on barter and border matters signed at Moscow.
- Mar. 24 Turkey and U.S.S.R. pledge neutrality if either attacked by third power.
- Apr. 5 Treaty of friendship and non-aggression with Yugoslavia signed at Moscow.
- " 13 5-year neutrality pact with Japan signed at Moscow, together with joint declaration on frontiers of "Manchukuo."
- May 6 Stalin became Premier (in addition to his other offices).
- " 9 Recognition withdrawn from German-occupied states.
- " 16 Diplomatic relations with Iraq established.
- Jun. 12 Trade treaty with Japan.
- " 22 German invasion.

1941

- Jun. 22 Germany and Italy declared war.
Rumania reentered Bessarabia.
Red Army raided Finland
- “ 26 Finland announced state of war.
- “ 27 Hungary declared war.
- “ 30 France (Vichy Government) severed diplomatic relations.
- Jul. 12 Mutual assistance pact with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (see p. 208) signed at Moscow.
- “ 18 Agreement with Provisional Czechoslovak Government.
- “ 30 Agreement with Poland on cooperation signed at London.
- Aug. 2 Exchange of notes with United States respecting economic assistance.¹
- “ 12 British-Soviet pledge to Turkey of respect for integrity and aid against attack.
- “ 14 Military agreement with Poland signed at Moscow.
- “ 16 Commercial treaty with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland signed.
- “ 25 British and Soviet troops enter Iran.
- Sept. 9 Iran accepted British-Soviet armistice terms.
- Nov. 7 Lend-lease aid extended by United States.
- “ 27 V. M. Molotov in a circular note laid emphasis on German atrocities.
- Dec. 4 Declaration of friendship and mutual assistance with Poland (see p. 361).

1942

- Jan. 6 V. M. Molotov in a second circular note made a declaration on “German atrocities against Red Army prisoners” and “atrocities against the civilian population.”
- “ 29 Soviet-British-Iranian Treaty.
- May 26 Treaty of alliance against Hitlerite Germany and her associates in Europe and of collaboration and mutual assistance with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
- Jun. 11 Mutual aid agreement with the United States (see p. 366).
- “ 12 Diplomatic relations with Canada established.
- “ 19 Soviet ratification of Anglo-Soviet Treaty of May 26, 1942.
- “ 25 British ratification of Anglo-Soviet Treaty of May 26, 1942.
- “ 27 Agreement with the United Kingdom for the financing of supplies to Russia signed at Moscow.
- Jul. 10 Establishment of diplomatic relations with the Netherlands.
- “ 31 Trade agreement with the United States renewed in Washington.
- Aug. 17 Official announcement of the return of Winston Churchill and W. Averell Harriman from a visit to Moscow.
- Sept. 8 Wheat agreement signed with Canada.
- “ 28 Recognition of French National Committee as administration of Fighting France.
- Nov. 19 Mexico re-established diplomatic relations.

Joseph Stalin, President of Council of People's Commissars and Chairman of the State Defense Committee, People's Commissar of Defense: Broadcast from Moscow, July 3, 1941

... This war with Fascist Germany cannot be considered an ordinary war. It is not only a war between two armies, it is also a great war of the

¹ For text see *D. S. Bul.*, V, p. 109, 115.

entire Soviet people against German Fascist forces. The aim of this people's war in defense of our country against Fascist oppressors is not only elimination of the danger hanging over our country but also aid to all European peoples groaning under the yoke of German Fascism.

In this war of liberation we shall not be alone. In this great war we shall have loyal allies in peoples of Europe and America, including German people who are enslaved by Hitlerite despots. Our war for freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties. It will be a united front of peoples standing for freedom and against enslavement and threats of enslavement by Hitler's Fascist armies. . . .

Stalin, Joseph, *The War of National Liberation*, p. 15-16.

Agreement for Joint Action by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the War against Germany, Signed at Moscow, July 12, 1941

[For text see section United Kingdom, p. 208]

Agreement between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Czechoslovakia, Signed at London, July 18, 1941

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Republic of Czechoslovakia have effected the following agreement:

1. The two Governments have agreed to exchange Ministers Plenipotentiary and Envoys Extraordinary immediately.

2. The two Governments acceded reciprocally to lend each other mutual aid of all kinds in the present war against Germany.

3. The Government of the U.S.S.R. consents to the formation on the territory of the U.S.S.R. of Czechoslovak national military units under the command of a person to be named by the Government of Czechoslovakia with the consent of the Soviet Government. Czechoslovak military units on the territory of the U.S.S.R. will operate under the direction of the Supreme Military Command of the U.S.S.R.

4. The present agreement enters into force from the moment of signature and is not subject to ratification.

5. The present agreement is drawn up in duplicate in the Russian and Czechoslovakian languages. The two texts are of equal validity.

I-A.R., 1941, I, 7, p. 5.

*Agreement between the Governments of Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, London, July 30, 1941*¹

ARTICLE 1 The Government of the U.S.S.R. recognizes the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland as having lost their validity. The Polish Government declares Poland is not bound by any agreement with any third power which is directed against the U.S.S.R.

ARTICLE 2. Diplomatic relations will be restored between the two Governments upon the signing of this agreement, and an immediate exchange of Ambassadors will be arranged.

ARTICLE 3. The two Governments mutually agree to render one to another aid and support of all kinds in the present war against Hitlerite Germany.

ARTICLE 4 The Government of the U.S.S.R. expresses its consent to the formation on territory of the U.S.S.R. of a Polish Army under a commander appointed by the Polish Government in agreement with the Soviet Government, the Polish Army on territory of the U.S.S.R. being subordinated in an operational sense to the Supreme Command of the U.S.S.R., in which the Polish Army will be represented. All details as to command, organization and employment of this force will be settled in a subsequent agreement.

ARTICLE 5. This agreement will come into force immediately upon signature and without ratification. The present agreement is drawn up in two copies in the Russian and Polish languages. Both texts have equal force.

¹ The ceremony of signature was reported as follows:

At the ceremony of signature, presided over by Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden said he wished to congratulate the two parties on the signature of the Agreement, which was, he believed, fair and advantageous to both sides.

General Sikorski said it was a turning point in history. Not all questions were settled, but a basis was provided for useful collaboration. The future would depend on the good will of both sides, and they possessed that good will.

M. Maisky thanked the British Government, and especially Mr. Eden, for all his efforts, and said the peoples of the Soviet Union had very friendly feelings towards the peoples of Poland. They had a common enemy, and would fight side by side against him, and this would pave the way to firm and solid friendship between the two peoples when the time came to build up a new Europe after the war had been won on the principle of self-determination of nations.

.

Mr. Churchill said the Agreement marked the association of two historic nations of Eastern Europe in the defense of human rights — the Russians and the Poles, whose long history had been checkered and darkened by their quarrels, whose future could be lightened by their comradeship. (*B I N.*, 1941, XVIII, 16, p. 1016-7.)

The Soviet Government grants amnesty to all Polish citizens now detained on Soviet territory either as prisoners of war or on other sufficient grounds, as from the resumption of diplomatic relations

Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, No. 123, December 6, 1941, p. C;
D.A.F.R., IV, p. 260.

Solomon A. Lozovsky, Assistant Chief of the Soviet Information Bureau at His Press Conference for Foreign Correspondents,¹ July 31, 1941

. . . The Soviet Union and Poland have a common enemy — Hitlerite Germany. This determines the common task of the Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Czechs, Serbs, Poles, and of all freedom-loving peoples of the world in general.

The agreement² providing for reestablishment of diplomatic relations, formation of a Polish army on territory of the U.S.S.R. etc., constitutes first of all an expression of the will of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and Poland jointly to bring the struggle against barbarian Hitlerism to a victorious end. By this agreement the Soviet Union openly stated before the whole world that it stands for the creation of a free and independent Poland and that it will fight arms in hand for its freedom and the freedom of Poland, for Poland to win her independence and for the Polish people to free itself from the sanguinary regime of the Nazi rulers.

No doubt all freedom-loving peoples and especially the whole population of Poland as well as all Poles scattered throughout the world will enthusiastically acclaim the agreement as a pledge of national liberation and state independence of Poland³

Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.* No. 17, p. 3-4.

Declaration of the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom Governments to Turkey, Ankara, August 10, 1941.⁴

[For text see section United Kingdom, p. 208]

¹ See also the editorials on "The Soviet-Polish Agreement" in the Soviet Government newspaper *Izvestia* (reprinted in *Inf. Bul.* No. 18, p. 5-10) and in *Pravda*, August 4 (reprinted in *Inf. Bul.* No. 21, p. 4-9)

² See p. 354.

³ See also Mr. Lozovsky's statement of July 17, 1941, in Moscow:

"... The Soviet Union, in principle, stood for the independence of Poland, as it did also for the independence of Czechoslovakia and other countries occupied by the Germans" (*B.I.N.*, 1941, XVIII, p. 998; *The Times*, July 18, 1941, p. 4)

⁴ For oral remarks of the Soviet Ambassador at Ankara (Vinogradov), August 10, 1941, see *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 686; *B.I.N.*, 1941, XVIII, p. 1079

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Ivan Maisky, Ambassador at London: Speech on Accepting the First Resolution (Atlantic Charter), September 24, 1941*¹

. . . The first task of all nations and all States compelled to wage war against Hitlerite Germany and her allies is to bring about the speediest and most decisive defeat of the aggressor. For the full accomplishment of that task they must assemble and devote all their strength and resources, and determine the most effective ways and means of reaching their goal. It is the task which at the present time unites all the Governments which have sent their representatives to this conference.

Our countries face also the most important problem of laying the basis for the organization of international relations, and of constituting the post-war world in such a way as to spare our peoples and our future generations the monstrous crimes of Nazism, incompatible with human culture. The U.S.S.R. is firmly convinced that this task will be successfully accomplished and that as a result of complete and final victory over Hitlerism there will be laid the true foundations of international cooperation and friendship, corresponding to the aspirations and ideals of freedom-loving peoples.

That is what all the peoples of my country are striving for. That is what inspires the Soviet Government in all its activities and in its foreign policy. The Soviet Union has applied, and will apply, in its foreign policy the high principle of respect for the sovereign rights of peoples.

The Soviet Union was, and is, guided in its foreign policy by the principle of self-determination of nations. It is guided by the same principle which, in fact, embodies recognition of the sovereignty and the equality of nations in its dealings with various nationalities embraced within the frontiers of the Soviet Union. Indeed, this principle forms one of the pillars on which the political structure of the U.S.S.R. is built

Accordingly, the Soviet Union defends the right of every nation to the independence and territorial integrity of its country, and its right to establish such a social order and to choose such a form of government as it deems opportune and necessary for the better promotion of its economic and cultural prosperity.

The Soviet Union, which followed that principle in all its policy and in all its relations with other nations, has consistently and with full force denounced all violations of sovereign rights of peoples, all aggression and aggressors, all and any attempts of aggressive states to impose their will upon other peoples and to involve them in war. The Soviet Union has

¹ For text of resolution, see section United Nations, p. 3.

untiringly and resolutely advocated, and advocates today, the necessity of collective action against aggressors, as one of the most effective means of bringing about the triumph of those principles, and advancing the peace and security of nations.

Striving for a radical solution of the problem of safeguarding freedom-loving peoples against all the dangers they encounter from aggressors, the Soviet Union has at the same time fought for complete and general disarmament. The Soviet Union is ready to give a fitting answer to any blow from the aggressor. At the same time it has been, and still is, building its foreign policy upon the desire to maintain peaceful and neighborly relations with all countries which respect the integrity and inviolability of its borders. The Soviet Union was, and is, willing to render all possible assistance to peoples becoming victims of aggression and fighting for the independence of their native land.

In accordance with a policy inspired by the above principles, which have been unswervingly applied by the Soviet Union, a policy which, moreover, has been expressed in numerous Acts and documents, the Soviet Government proclaims its agreement with the fundamental principles of the declaration of Mr. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and of Mr. Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain — principles which are so important in the present international circumstances.

Considering that the practical application of these principles will necessarily adapt itself to the circumstances, needs, and historic peculiarities of particular countries, the Soviet Government can state that a consistent application of these principles will secure the most energetic support on the part of the Government and peoples of the Soviet Union.

At the same time, the Soviet Government considers it imperative to declare with particular emphasis that all peoples which have recognized the necessity of smashing Hitlerite aggression and annihilating the yoke of Nazism today have one main task: to mobilize all the economic and military resources of freedom-loving peoples, in order to attain a full and speedy emancipation of the nations groaning under the oppression of the Hitlerite hordes.

Attributing great importance to the equitable use of all material resources and foodstuffs in the post-war period, the Soviet Government believes that the most imperative and most pressing task of today is the correct allocation of all the economic resources and war supplies with a view to an early liberation of all the European peoples now oppressed by Hitlerite slavery.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Ivan Maisky, Ambassador at London: Speech on Accepting the Second Resolution (Post-War Economic Needs of Europe),¹ September 24, 1941

The Soviet Government has no objections to, and is prepared to accept, the first five paragraphs of the draft resolution under discussion. With regard, however, to paragraph 6, I have to make the following statement:

The Soviet Government has no objection to the principle dealt with in paragraph 6, but it considers it very important that the central bureau, which is envisaged there, should have an inter-Allied character and, for this purpose, should be built on the basis of equal representation of all the Governments concerned. The Soviet Government, with this aim in view, also believes that the best way to proceed in this matter would be to submit all the questions concerning the structure, scope of activities, forms and methods of work, etc., of this bureau for preliminary consideration to the Allied Governments so that a final decision on this point can be approved of at the next Inter-Allied Conference.

As a consequence the Soviet Government is not able to accept paragraph 6 in its present form and reserves its right to put forward at a later date certain proposals in this connection.

U.K., Cmd 6315. Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 29;
I-A R., 1941, I, 9, p. 10-11.

Joseph Stalin, as Chairman of the State Defense Committee: Speech to the Moscow Soviet on the Anniversary of the October Revolution, Moscow, November 6, 1941

. . . The war has thus become the turning point in the development of our country for the past year. The war has considerably curtailed and in some cases completely stopped our peaceful construction. It compels our whole work to be reorganized on a war footing. It has transformed our country into a single, all-embracing rear serving the front, serving our Red Army, our Red Navy

The period of peaceful construction has ended. The period of the war of liberation against the German invaders has begun. . . .

The Soviet rear was never as strong as today. It is quite credible that with such losses as we have today, any other state would fail to withstand the ordeals and would deteriorate. If the Soviet system was able so easily to withstand the ordeal and still further to strengthen its rear, this means that the Soviet system is now the strongest system. . . .

¹ For text of resolution, see section United Nations, p 4

. . The German invaders want a war of extermination against the peoples of the U S S R. Well, if the Germans want a war of extermination, they shall have it.

Henceforth our task, the task of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., the task of the men, commanders and political workers of our army and our navy, consists in annihilating to the last man all Germans who penetrated the territory of our country as its occupationists

No mercy to the German occupationists! Death to the German occupationists!

The rout of the German imperialists and their armies is inevitable. The fact alone that in their moral degradation the German invaders, having lost the human aspect, have already sunk to the level of wild beasts — this fact alone shows that they have doomed themselves to inevitable death.

But the inevitable death of the Hitler invaders and their armies is determined not by moral factors alone.

There are three other basic factors whose force is growing from day to day and which must in the near future lead to the inevitable rout of the Hitler robber imperialists. These are, first, the instability of the European rear of imperialist Germany, the instability of the "new order" in Europe. The German invaders have enslaved the peoples of the European continent from France to the Soviet Baltic, from Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, and Soviet Byelorussia to the Balkans and the Soviet Ukraine, have deprived them of their elementary democratic liberties, deprived them of the right to control their own destiny, deprived them of grain, meat, and raw materials, converted them into their slaves, crucified the Poles, Czechs, and Serbs, and decided that by achieving the domination of Europe they would be able to build Germany's world domination on this basis. . . .

Only the Hitlerite fools from Berlin can fail to understand that the enslaved peoples of Europe will fight and will rise against Hitler tyranny. Who can doubt that the U S S R, Great Britain and the United States will render full aid to the peoples of Europe in their liberation struggle against Hitler tyranny?

Secondly, the instability of the German rear of the Hitlerite invaders. While the Hitlerites were uniting Germany, dismembered under the Versailles Treaty, they could have the support of the German people, inspired by the idea of the restoration of Germany. But after this task was solved and the Hitlerites took to the path of imperialism, to the path of seizure of foreign lands and conquest of foreign peoples, having converted the peoples of Europe and the peoples of the U.S.S.R. into avowed

enemies of present-day Germany, the German people have taken the profound turn of opposing the war and are in favor of liquidation of the war. . . .

Only Hitlerite fools can fail to understand that not only the European rear but also the German rear of the German troops represent a volcano ready to erupt and bury the Hitler adventurists.

And finally there is the coalition of the U S S R., Great Britain, and the United States against the German fascist imperialists. It is a fact that Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union have united into a single camp which has set itself the task of crushing the Hitler imperialists and their armies of conquest. The present war is a war of motors. He who will have the overwhelming superiority in the production of motors will win the war. If we combine the output of the motors of the United States, Great Britain, and the U.S.S.R. we will have a superiority in motors of at least three to one as compared with Germany. Herein lies one of the bases of the inevitable doom of Hitler's robber imperialism. . . .

. . . Unlike Hitlerite Germany, the Soviet Union and its allies are waging a war for liberation — a just war for the liberation of the enslaved peoples of Europe and the U.S.S.R. from Hitler's tyranny. Therefore, all honest people must support the armies of the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the other allies as armies of liberation.

We have not nor can we have such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories or the conquest of other peoples, irrespective of whether European peoples and territories or Asiatic peoples and territories, including Iran, are concerned. Our first aim is to liberate our territories and our peoples from the German Nazi yoke.

We have not nor can we have such war aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on the Slavic and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are waiting for our help. Our aim is to help these peoples in their struggle for liberation from Hitler's tyranny, and then to accord them the possibility of arranging their lives on their own land as they think fit, with absolute freedom. No interference of any kind with the domestic affairs of other nations!

But to realize these aims it is necessary to crush the military might of the German invaders. It is necessary to exterminate to the last man all the German invaders who have penetrated our native land to enslave it. . . .

This is our task. Now we can and must fulfil this task. Only by fulfilling this task and routing the German invaders can we achieve a lasting and just peace.

For the complete destruction of the German invaders!

For the liberation of all oppressed peoples groaning under the yoke of Hitlerite tyranny! . . .

Copy received from the Embassy of the U.S.S.R.,
Washington, D.C.

Joint Declaration of Friendship and Mutual Aid by the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the Polish Republic, signed by Joseph Stalin and General Wladyslaw Sikorski, Moscow, December 4, 1941

The Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the Polish Republic, imbued with a spirit of friendly concord and fighting collaboration, declare:

1. German Hitlerite imperialism is the worst enemy of mankind — no compromise with it is possible. Both States, jointly with Great Britain and other Allies and with the support of the United States of America, will wage war until complete victory and the final destruction of the German invaders.

2. Implementing the treaty concluded July 30, 1941, both Governments will render each other during the war full military assistance, and the troops of the Polish Republic located in territory of the Soviet Union will wage war against the German bandits hand in hand with the Soviet troops. In peace-time their relations will be based on good neighborly collaboration, friendship, and mutual honest observance of the undertakings they have assumed.

3. After the victorious war and appropriate punishment of the Hitlerite criminals, it will be the task of the Allied States to ensure a durable and just peace. This can be achieved only through a new organization of international relations on the basis of unification of the democratic countries in a durable alliance. Respect for international law backed by the collective armed force of all the Allied States, must form the decisive factor in the creation of such an organization. Only under this condition can a Europe destroyed by the German barbarians be restored and can a guarantee be created that the disaster caused by the Hitlerites will never be repeated.

Embassy U.S.S.R. *Inf. Bul.*, No. 123, p. A, B,
D.A.F.R., IV, p. 261.

Maxim Litvinov, Ambassador to the United States: Speech Presenting His Credentials to President Roosevelt at the White House, Washington, December 8, 1941

. . . The struggle against the aggression of Hitler and his imitators and against his voluntary and involuntary allies — a struggle in which

all the liberties, all the spiritual, moral, cultural and political values, gained by humanity in the course of many centuries, are at stake, is becoming more and more the cause of all honest, liberty-loving people, peace-loving people. While the heaviest blows and sacrifices in this struggle have fallen to the lot of the Soviet Union, the part played in it by the United States is becoming more and more prominent and active.

The successful outcome of this struggle in the shortest possible time will to a great extent depend on the coordination of the activities of its more energetic and powerful participants, on the timely and rational use of their resources, and last but not least on the maintenance among themselves of the utmost mutual understanding and confidence, which will be necessary not merely during the struggle itself, but also during the subsequent period. . . .

Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, No. 126, p. 2; *D. S. Bul.*, V, p. 504.

Maxim Litvinov, Ambassador to the United States: Statement, Washington, January 1, 1942

A short time ago my Government signed important documents with the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, documents which will form new links in the chain of friendship uniting these three states, to whose share has fallen the most active struggle with the aggressors. These documents will constitute valuable material for the foundation of the future organization of peace on the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter and the declarations of the 26 Nations

Copy received from the Embassy of the U.S.S.R.,
Washington, D.C.

Treaty of Alliance between the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Iran, Signed at Tehran, January 29, 1942

[For text see section United Kingdom, p. 224]

Joseph Stalin, the People's Commissar of Defense: Order of the Day on the Twenty-Fourth Anniversary of the Founding of the Red Army, February 23, 1942

. . . Occasionally the foreign press engages in prattle to the effect that the Red Army's aim is to exterminate the German people and destroy the German State. This is, of course, a stupid lie and a witless slander against the Red Army. The Red Army has not and cannot have such idiotic aims. The Red Army's aim is to drive out the German occupants from our country and liberate Soviet soil from the German fascist invaders.

It is very likely that the war for liberation of the Soviet land will result in ousting or destroying Hitler's clique. We should welcome such an outcome. But it would be ridiculous to identify Hitler's clique with the German people and the German State. History shows that Hitlers come and go, but the German people and the German State remain.

Lastly, the strength of the Red Army lies in the fact that it does not and cannot entertain racial hatred for other peoples, including the German people, that it has been brought up in the spirit of the equality of all peoples and races, in the spirit of respect for the rights of other peoples. . . .

Embassy, U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, 1942, No. 24, p. 5, Stalin, Joseph, *The War of National Liberation*, p. 44.

Maxim Litvinov, Ambassador to the United States: Speech Delivered at the Economics Club Dinner, New York, March 16, 1942

. . . We are all interested in the speediest possible ending of the war, the speediest possible conclusion of a just peace treaty, enabling each nation to develop in accordance with its own aspirations and ideals, without interference from outside, and in no fear of war again breaking out.

Embassy, U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, 1942, No. 33, p. 3.

Maxim Litvinov, Ambassador to the United States: Speech Delivered before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 10, 1942

. . . I mean united efforts now, for the definite purpose of inflicting defeat on Hitler on the only front where this is possible. Victory may be long in coming if one State has to exhaust its major forces in today's military operations, while another harbors them for possible operations at some indefinite time in the future.

But the infliction of defeat and the attainment of victory cannot be our ultimate aim. United efforts are required also for the final eradication of the Nazi-fascist tree with its poisoned fruits, for the healing of the wounds suffered by humanity in this blood-thirsty war, for the creation on a new basis of future economic and political international relations.

It seems to me that the more easily we can achieve united efforts now, all participants in the struggle making about equal sacrifices, the more successful will be our united efforts for the organization of the peace — a true peace — based on unity and concord.

Embassy, U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, 1942, No. 44, p. 5.

Joseph Stalin, People's Commissar of Defense: Order-of-the-Day Number 130, Moscow, May 1, 1942

.

As for the international relations of our motherland, they have recently grown and gained strength as never before. All freedom-loving peoples have joined forces against German imperialism. Their eyes are turned to the Soviet Union. The heroic struggle which the peoples of our country are waging for their freedom, honor, and independence calls forth the admiration of all progressive humanity. The peoples of all freedom-loving countries regard the Soviet Union as a force capable of saving the world from the Hitlerite plague. First place among these freedom-loving countries is held by Great Britain and the United States of America, to which we are bound by ties of friendship and alliance and which are rendering our country constantly increasing military assistance against the German fascist invaders. All these circumstances show that our country has become much stronger

.

These are the conclusions from the experience of war with the German fascist invaders. What do they show? They show that we can and must continue to smite the German fascist invaders in the future until their final extermination and the final liberation of the Soviet land from the Hitlerite scoundrels.

Comrades! We are waging a patriotic war of liberation, a just war. We do not set ourselves the aim of seizing foreign countries, of conquering foreign peoples. Our aim is clear and noble. We want to liberate our Soviet land from the German fascist scoundrels. We want to liberate our brothers, the Ukrainians, Moldavians, Belorussians, Lithuanians, Letts, Estonians, and Karelians, from the disgrace and humiliation to which they are subjected by the German fascist scoundrels.

To achieve this aim we must defeat the German fascist army and exterminate the German occupants to the last man, as long as they will not surrender. There is no other way. We can do this and we must do this at any cost. The Red Army possesses everything necessary to achieve this lofty aim. Only one thing is lacking — ability to make full use against the enemy of the first-rate armament supplied to it by our motherland. Therefore, the task of the Red Army — its men, its machine gunners, its artillerymen, its trench mortar crews, its tankists, its flyers and cavalrymen — is to study military art, to study persistently,

to learn their arms to perfection, to become experts in their line, and thus to learn to defeat the enemy surely. Only in this way can one learn the art of defeating the enemy.

Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, 1942, No 53, p 3;
I-A.R., 1942, II, 5, p. 109-111.

Treaty of Alliance in the War against Hitlerite Germany and Her Associates in Europe and of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance Thereafter Concluded between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Signed at London, May 26, 1942

[For text see section United Kingdom, p 235]

Vyacheslav M. Molotov, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs: Speech on the Occasion of the Signature of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty, London, May 26, 1942¹

. . . The present treaty also determines the common line of action of the Soviet Union and Great Britain after the war. The fact that this treaty operates for a period of twenty years and is based on mutual military and economic assistance against possible further aggression on the part of Germany, and is intended to insure the security and economic well-being of the peoples of Europe, speaks for itself.

Hitler and his accomplices in their blood-stained robbery of Europe will now feel more than ever that the united forces of their adversaries have been rallied and strengthened. So much the better for us, for our peoples and for our common cause.

This treaty signifies and contains much more than the Anglo-Soviet agreement of last year.

The treaty of May 26, 1942, marks a new and important stage in the development of Anglo-Soviet relations on the basis of alliance and mutual military assistance against our common and irreconcilable foe, both of today and of the future, in Europe. It provides a desired basis for joint action after the war, thus greatly adding to its importance. . . .

U. K., Cmd. 6368, Russia No. 1 (1942); *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 259.

¹ The Treaty was ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in Moscow on June 19, 1942, and entered into force July 4, 1942. See Mr. Molotov's elaborate speech before the Supreme Soviet (Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.* No 74, p 1-5).

Agreement between the Governments of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Principles Applying to Mutual Aid in the Prosecution of the War against Aggression, Signed by the Ambassador to the United States (Litvinov) and the Secretary of State (Hull), Washington, June 11, 1942

The provisions of the agreement are the same in all substantial respects as those of the agreement between the United States and Great Britain signed on February 23, 1942¹

The second paragraph of the preamble is similar to but not identical with the second paragraph of the preamble of the British agreement. It reads as follows:

And whereas the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as signatories of the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, have subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Joint Declaration, known as the Atlantic Charter,² made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the basic principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941; . . .

To the first paragraph of Article VII of the British Agreement are added the following words:

. . . the basic principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.³

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 532-5.

*Vyacheslav M. Molotov, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs: Declaration of the Soviet Government Concerning the Responsibility of the Hitlerite Invaders and Their Associates for Crimes Committed by Them in Occupied Countries of Europe, Moscow, October 14, 1942*⁴

. . . The Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., having taken note of the appeal addressed to him by the representatives of countries temporarily occupied by Hitlerite Germany, that he issue a solemn warning on the responsibility for the crimes committed by the Hitlerites in the territories they seized, the Chairman of

¹ For text of the master agreement see section United Nations, p. 10.

² For Russian press comments on the Atlantic Charter, see *N.Y.T.*, August 17, 1941.

³ See p. 356.

⁴ See also his statement, Moscow, April 27, 1942. (Embassy, U S S R, Washington, D.C.).

the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., Stalin, has instructed the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs to convey to the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Norway, Greece, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg, and the French National Committee, the following declaration of the Soviet Government:

The Soviet Government and the whole Soviet people regard with fraternal solidarity and deep sympathy the sufferings and struggle for liberation of the peoples of the countries of Europe occupied by Hitlerite Germany. . . .

. . . The information on the atrocities of the Hitlerite occupationists and their associates conveyed to the Soviet Government in the joint appeal received, once more confirms the universal and deliberate character of their sanguinary crimes, proving that the German Fascist government and its associates, striving to enslave the peoples of the occupied countries, to destroy their culture and humiliate their national self-respect have also set themselves the purpose of direct physical extermination of a large part of the population in the captured territory . . .

In the notes of the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Molotov, of November 25, 1941 on the abominable atrocities committed by the German authorities with regard to Soviet war prisoners; of January 6 (this year) on the universal plunder and ruination of the population and the monstrous atrocities committed by the German authorities on Soviet territory seized by them, and of April 27 (this year) on the monstrous crimes, atrocities and violence perpetrated by the German Fascist invaders in Soviet districts occupied by them, and on the responsibility of the German Government and Command for these crimes — sent to all governments with which the Soviet Union maintains diplomatic relations the Soviet Government placed "full responsibility for the inhuman and bandit actions of German troops with the criminal Hitlerite Government of Germany," and declared that "the Hitlerite Government and its accomplices will not escape the stern responsibility and deserved punishment for all the unparalleled villainies they have perpetrated against the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and all freedom-loving peoples."

The Soviet Government also stated that its organs "keep a detailed record of all these villainous crimes of the Hitlerite army for which the indignant Soviet people justly demands and will obtain retribution."

Having acquainted itself with the information received concerning the monstrous crimes committed and being committed now by the Hitlerites on the orders of the government and military and civil authorities of Germany in the territories of France, Czechoslovakia, Poland,

Yugoslavia, Norway, Greece, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg, and giving wide publicity to the information received from the representatives of these countries the Soviet Government hereby once more declares, for the whole world to hear, and with utter determination and firmness, that the criminal Hitlerite Government and all its accomplices must and shall pay a deserved and severe penalty for the crimes committed by it against the peoples of the Soviet Union and against all freedom-loving peoples in the territories temporarily occupied by the German army and its associates

The Soviet Government approves and shares the legitimate desire, expressed in the joint note received, to ensure that those guilty of the above-mentioned crimes are turned over to justice and that the sentences which will be passed be carried into effect. The Soviet Government is prepared to support practical measures toward this aim taken by the Allied and friendly governments and expects that all interested states will mutually assist each other in the searching for, extradition, prosecution and stern punishment of the Hitlerites and their accomplices guilty of the organization, encouragement or perpetration of crimes on occupied territory.

The Soviet Government is in agreement with the declaration of the President of the United States of America, Franklin D. Roosevelt, made in his speech on October 12, regarding the punishment of "Nazi leaders responsible for the innumerable brutal acts," namely that "the clique of leaders and their cruel accomplices must be called by name, arrested and tried under criminal law."

All mankind is already aware of the names and sanguinary crimes of the ringleaders of the criminal Hitlerite clique — Hitler, Goering, Hess, Goebbels, Himmler, Ribbentrop, Rosenberg and other organizers of German atrocities, from among the leaders of Fascist Germany. The Soviet Government considers itself, as well as the governments of all states defending their independence from the Hitlerite hordes, obliged to regard the severe punishment of these already unmasked ringleaders of the criminal Hitlerite gang as its urgent duty to the innumerable widows and orphans, relatives and friends, of those innocent people who have been brutally tortured to death and murdered on the instructions of the above-named criminals.

The Soviet Government considers it necessary that any one of the leaders of Fascist Germany who in the course of the war has already fallen into the hands of the authorities of states fighting against Hitlerite Germany be brought to trial without delay before a special international tribunal and punished with all the severity of criminal law.

In renewing at present its warning concerning the weight of responsibility which the criminal Hitlerite rulers and all their accomplices must bear for the monstrous atrocities committed by them, the Soviet Government considers it timely to reaffirm the conviction expressed in its official declarations to the effect that the Hitlerite Government, which recognizes only brute force, "must be broken by the crushing force of freedom-loving peoples," since "the interests of all humanity demand that the band of savage murderers called the government of Hitlerite Germany must be done away with as soon as possible and once and forever."

Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, 1942, No. 124, October 17, 1942.

Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the Formation of an Extraordinary State Committee for the Investigation of Crimes Committed by the German Fascist Invaders, Moscow, November 2, 1942

Having treacherously attacked the Soviet Union, the German Fascist invaders and their associates have committed monstrous crimes on the Soviet territory they temporarily occupied. . . .

For all these monstrous crimes being committed by the German Fascist invaders and their accomplices and for all the material damages they have caused to Soviet citizens, collective farms, cooperative and other public bodies, State enterprises and institutions of the Soviet Union, the criminal Hitlerite government, the German Army Command and their associates bear full criminal and material responsibility.

For the full registration of the villainous crimes committed by the Germans and their accomplices and the damage caused by them to citizens on collective farms, public bodies, State enterprises and institutions of the U.S.S.R., for the unification and coordination of the work already being done by Soviet State organs for the registration of these crimes and the damage caused by the invaders, for the definition of damage caused by the German occupationists and their associates to citizens of the Soviet Union and for establishing the size of possible compensation for personal damage, for the definition, date and extent of the damage sustained by Soviet State and collective farms and public bodies and subject to compensation in conformity with the just demands of the Soviet people, for the identification in all cases where it will be possible of the German Fascist criminals guilty of the organization or perpetration of crimes on occupied Soviet territory with the object of the prosecution of these criminals and their strict punishment, the

Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics resolves.

1. To form an extraordinary State commission for ascertaining and investigating crimes committed by the German Fascist invaders and their associates and damages caused by them to citizens of collective farms, public bodies, State enterprises and institutions of the U.S.S.R.

2 To charge the extraordinary State commission for the investigation of crimes committed by the German Fascist invaders with the collection of the documentary data, their verification and the preparation of all materials concerning crimes committed by the Hitlerite criminals and the damage caused to Soviet citizens, collective farms and the State as a result of the occupation of Soviet territories by the armies of Hitlerite Germany and her associates.

With this end in view the commission must conduct as fully as possible the registration of:

A. The facts of the murders of peaceful citizens and the outrages perpetrated by the occupationists upon defenseless persons — women, children and old men — as well as the facts of the abduction of Soviet people into German slavery.

B The damages caused by the Hitlerite invaders to the Soviet population by the destruction of houses and other buildings, the pillage and destruction of implements, foodstocks, cattle and poultry, household articles and also by exacting from the population indemnities, fines, taxes and other levies.

C. The damages caused by the invasion and brigandage of German Fascist occupationists to collective farms, cooperatives, trade unions and other public bodies through ransacking and destruction of building structures and equipment serving the needs of production, cultural or material needs, of raw materials, foodstuffs and commodities, sowings of agricultural crops, forest tracts, fruit and other plantations, as well as other collective farm and cooperative property

D. The damages caused by occupationists to state enterprises and institutions of the Soviet Union through the destruction and looting of plants, factories, power stations, mines, oil fields, various industrial structures, the equipment of railways, highways, bridges, canals and hydrotechnical structures, railway stations and harbor structures, sea- and river-going ships, automobiles and horse-drawn vehicles, communication facilities, also forests, agricultural lands, harvests, perennial plantations and other national property.

E. The damages caused by the Hitler invaders through the ransacking and destruction of artistic, cultural and historical values of the

peoples of the U S S R , the destruction of museums, scientific institutions, hospitals, schools, establishments of higher education, libraries, theatres and other cultural institutions, also buildings, equipment and utensils of religious worship.

F. The damages caused to the population and Soviet State by the evacuation of citizens, industrial enterprises, the property of collective farms and other public bodies to the interior of the U S S R.

3. To authorize the extraordinary State commission to charge appropriate organs with investigations, interrogations of victims, the gathering testimony of witnesses and other documentary data relating to violence, atrocities, plunder, destruction and other criminal actions of the Hitlerite occupationists and their associates To bind local organs of the State Government to render the extraordinary State commission every assistance in its work.

4. To appoint the following members of the extraordinary State commission for ascertaining and investigation of crimes committed by the German Fascist invaders and their associates and damage caused by them to citizens of collective farms, public bodies, State enterprises and institutions of the U S S R.

Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, No. 134, November 10, 1942, p. 3.

Joseph Stalin, People's Commissar of Defense: Speech Delivered to the Moscow Soviet on the Anniversary of the October Revolution of 1917, Moscow, November 6, 1942

.

(4) — *The fighting alliance of the U.S.S R , Great Britain and the United States of America against Hitlerite Germany and her allies in Europe.* It may now be considered indisputable that in the course of the war imposed upon the nations by Hitlerite Germany, a radical demarcation of forces and formation of two opposite camps have taken place — the camp of the Italo-German coalition and the camp of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition It is equally indisputable that these two opposing coalitions are guided by two different and opposite programs of action. The program of action of the Italo-German coalition may be described by the following points:

Racial hatred, domination of chosen nations, subjugation of other nations and seizure of their territories, economic enslavement of subjugated nations and spoliation of their national wealth, destruction of democratic liberties, the institution of the Hitlerite regime everywhere.

The program of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition is:

Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations and integrity of their territories, liberation of enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes, economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance to them in attaining their material welfare, restoration of democratic liberties, the destruction of the Hitlerite regime

The effect of the program of action of the Italo-German coalition has been that all the occupied countries of Europe — Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece and the occupied regions of the U S S. R. — are burning with hatred of the Italo-German tyrants, are causing all the damage they can to the Germans and their allies and are waiting for a favorable opportunity to take revenge on their conquerors for the humiliation and violence they are suffering.

In this connection one of the characteristic features of the present moment is the progressively growing isolation of the Italo-German coalition and the depletion of its moral and political reserves in Europe, its growing weakness and disintegration.

The effect of the program of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition has been that all the occupied countries in Europe are in full sympathy with the members of this coalition and are prepared to render them all the help of which they are capable.

In this connection another characteristic feature of the present moment is that the moral and political reserves of this coalition are growing from day to day in Europe, and that this coalition is progressively winning millions of sympathizers ready to join it in fighting against Hitlerite tyranny. If the relative strength of these two coalitions is examined from the standpoint of human and material resources, one cannot help reaching the conclusion that the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition has the indisputable advantage.

But the question is: Is this advantage alone sufficient for victory? There are occasions, as we know, when resources are abundant, but they are expended so unprofitably that the advantage is nullified. Obviously, what is needed in addition to resources is the capacity to mobilize these resources and the ability to expend them properly. Is there any reason for doubting the existence of such ability, of such capacity on the part of the men of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition? There are people who doubt this. But what grounds have they for their doubts?

There was a time when the men of this coalition displayed their ability and capacity to mobilize the resources of their countries and expend

them properly for the purposes of economic, cultural and political development. One asks: What grounds are there for doubting that the men who have displayed capacity and ability in mobilizing and distributing resources for economic, cultural and political purposes will prove incapable of doing the same things for the purposes of war? I think there are no such doubts.

It is said that the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition has every chance of winning and will certainly win if it did not have one organic defect, which is capable of weakening and disintegrating it. This defect, in the opinion of these people, is that this coalition consists of heterogeneous elements with different ideologies and that this circumstance will prevent their organizing joint action against the common enemy.

I think that this assertion is wrong. It would be ridiculous to deny the difference in ideologies and social systems of the countries composing the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. But does this preclude the possibility and expediency of joint action on the part of members of this coalition against the common enemy who holds out the threat of enslavement for them? It certainly does not preclude it.

More, the existence of this threat imperatively imposes the necessity of joint action upon the members of the coalition in order to save mankind from a reversion to savagery and medieval brutality. Is not the program of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition a sufficient basis for the organization of the joint struggle against the Hitlerite tyranny and for the achievement of victory over it? I think that it is quite sufficient.

The assumption of these people is also wrong because of the fact that it is completely refuted by the events of the past year. And indeed, if these people were right, we should be observing the progressive mutual alienation of the members of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition.

Yet far from observing this, we have facts and events pointing to a progressive rapprochement between the members of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition and their uniting into a single fighting alliance.

The events of the past year supply direct proof of this. In July 1941, several weeks after Germany attacked the U.S.S.R., Great Britain concluded with us an agreement "on joint action in the war against Germany."¹ At that time we had not yet any agreement with the United States of America on this subject. Ten months later, May 26, 1942, during Comrade Molotov's visit to Great Britain, the latter concluded with us a "treaty of alliance in the war against Hitlerite Germany and

¹ See p. 208.

her associates in Europe and on collaboration and mutual aid thereafter." This treaty was concluded for a period of 20 years. It marks a historic turning point in relations between our country and Great Britain.

In June 1942, during Comrade Molotov's visit to the United States, the United States of America concluded with us an "agreement on principles applicable to mutual aid in the conduct of the war against aggression," an agreement representing a substantial advance in relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

Lastly, one should mention so important a fact as the visit to Moscow of the British Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, which established complete mutual understanding between the leaders of the two countries.

There can be no doubt that all these facts point to progressive rapprochement between the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the United States of America and their uniting in a fighting alliance against the Italo-German coalition.

It follows that the logic of things is stronger than any other logic. There can be only one conclusion, namely, that the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition has every chance of vanquishing the Italo-German coalition, and certainly will vanquish it.

(5) *Our tasks.* The war has torn off all veils and laid bare all relationships. The situation has become so clear that nothing is easier than to define our tasks in this war. In an interview with the Turkish General Erkilet, published in the Turkish newspaper *Cumhuriyet*, that cannibal Hitler said: "We shall destroy Russia so that she will never be able to rise again." That would appear clear although rather silly. It is not our aim to destroy Germany, for it is impossible to destroy Germany, just as it is impossible to destroy Russia. But the Hitlerite state can and should be destroyed. And our first task, in fact, is to destroy the Hitlerite state and its inspirers.

In the same interview with the same general that cannibal Hitler went on to say: "We shall continue the war until Russia ceases to have an organized military force." That would appear clear, although illiterate. It is not our aim to destroy all organized military force in Germany, for every literate person will understand that this is not only impossible in regard to Germany, as it is in regard to Russia, but also inadvisable from the point of view of the victor. But Hitler's army can and should be destroyed.

Our second task is, in fact, to destroy Hitler's army and its leaders. The Hitlerite scoundrels have made it a rule to torture Soviet war prisoners, to slay them by the hundreds and to condemn thousands of them to death by starvation. They outrage and slaughter the civilian popu-

lation of occupied territories of our country, men and women, children and old folk, our brothers and sisters. They have made it their aim to enslave or exterminate the population of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Baltic Republics, Moldavia, the Crimea and the Caucasus.

Only villains and scoundrels bereft of all honor and fallen to the level of beasts can permit themselves such outrages toward innocent, unarmed people.

But that is not all. They have covered Europe with gallows and concentration camps; they have introduced a vile "system of hostages." They shoot and hang absolutely innocent citizens taken as "hostages," because some German beast was prevented from violating women or robbing citizens. They have converted Europe into a prison of nations. And this they call "the new order in Europe."

We know who are the men guilty of these outrages, the builders of "the new order in Europe," all those newly baked governor generals or just ordinary governors, commandants and sub-commandants. Their names are known to tens of thousands of tormented people. Let these butchers know that they will not escape responsibility for their crimes or elude the avenging hand of the tormented nations.

Our third task is to destroy the hated "new order in Europe," and to punish its builders.

Such are our tasks.

Comrades, we are waging a great war of liberation. We are not waging it alone, but in conjunction with our Allies. It will end in our victory over the vile foes of mankind, over the German-Fascist imperialists.

On our standard is inscribed: "Hail the victory of the Anglo-Soviet-American fighting alliance! Hail the liberation of the nations of Europe from Hitler's tyranny! Hail the liberty and independence of our glorious Soviet motherland! Execration and death to the German-Fascist invaders, their state, their army, their "new order in Europe"!"

Glory to our Red Army!

Glory to our Navy!

Glory to our men and women guerrillas!

Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, No. 135, November 12, 1942, p. 1-6;
Int. Con., No. 386, January 1943, p. 40.

Maxim Litvinov, Ambassador to the United States: Address to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, Madison Square Garden, New York, November 8, 1942

The idea of German revenge, converted by Hitler into the idea of fascist supremacy over the world, could only have been based upon

speculations as to the division of the great powers into two camps, in one of which the Soviet Union was to be isolated. Sincere and close cooperation between the great powers and the Soviet Union would, on the other hand, have destroyed the *raison d'être* of Hitlerism and upset all the calculations of the aggressive countries. It would not be hard to prove that such cooperation would have prevented each and every act of international aggression, beginning from 1931 and crowned by the present war.

It is to be hoped that lessons will be drawn both for the present and the future, through the acknowledgment of this mistake. Friendship between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., based upon complete mutual understanding, confidence, and respect, should occupy a conspicuous place in the system of United Nations cooperation — cooperation dictated by the common interest in bringing the war to a victorious end, and quite essential for the solution of the vast problems bound to arise after the war. There is not and never has been any serious obstacle to this friendship. The only obstacles have been set up artificially by elements in all countries, consciously or unconsciously aiding the development and triumph of fascism, Hitlerism and aggression. I am glad to say that the recognition of the necessity for exposing and removing these apparent obstacles is sinking ever deeper into the consciousness of the American people. The Congress just held and this rally, under the banner of Soviet-American Friendship, are eloquent testimony to this.

We should all like to believe that the old prejudices, the obsolete ideas which have led to the artificial division of races and peoples, and to perpetual conflicts between them, resulting in Hitlerism as their logical conclusion, will perish in the devouring flames of global war. Only when it has shaken off these prejudices and false theories can humanity create a *real* new order of inter-racial and international relations, and find the path to peace, freedom and happiness.

Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.* 1942, No. 136, November 14, 1942.

Vyacheslav M. Molotov, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs: Statement on Attitude toward Albania, Moscow, December 18, 1942¹

The Soviet Union fully sympathizes with the courageous struggle for liberation waged by Albanian patriots against Italian occupationists, does not recognize any claims of Italian imperialism to Albanian ter-

¹ For other statements on Albania see section United States, p. 146, United Kingdom, p. 273, Greece, p. 546.

ritory, and wishes to see Albania freed from the yoke of the fascist invaders and restored to independence.

The Soviet Government is certain that the struggle of the Albanian people for its independence will merge with the struggle for liberation waged by other Balkan peoples oppressed by the Italo-German occupationists, and that these people in alliance with all freedom-loving countries will oust the invaders from their land.

The problem of the future state system of Albania is her domestic affair and must be decided by the Albanian people itself.

Embassy, U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, No. 150, p. 1.

V. CHINA

The National Government of the Republic of China was inaugurated October 10, 1928 and derived its original mandate from the Organic Law promulgated October 4, 1928 by the authority of the Kuomintang or Nationalist Party. During the so-called "period of tutelage" of the Chinese people, supreme effective control resides in the National Congress of the Kuomintang. Since July 7, 1937, Japan has waged war on China. Shortly after its outbreak, a Supreme National Defense Council was created, under the chairmanship of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, which directs all political and military affairs. There are five minority parties all of which have pledged support to the National Government since armed resistance to Japan was undertaken.

1941

- Apr. 25 Stabilization agreement with the United States.¹
- " 26 Financial agreement with the United Kingdom.
- Dec. 9 Formal declaration of war on the Japanese Empire and on Germany and Italy.

1942

- Jan. 2 Appointment of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to supreme command of all forces of the United Nations in the Chinese theatre of war
- " 9 Declaration on punishment for war crimes (see p. 9).
- Feb. 9 Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek arrived in Delhi for visit with Indian leaders.
- Mar. 20 Treaty of friendship with Iraq signed in Baghdad.
- " 21 Financial agreement with the United States.²
- " 31 Treaty of friendship signed with Turkey.
- Jun. 2 Mutual Aid Agreement between the United States and China (see p. 392).
- Oct. 9 Declaration by the United States Government and by the British Government regarding relinquishment of all extraterritorial rights in China.
- " 26 Treaty of friendship, commerce and shipping concluded with Argentina.
- Dec. 31 Extension of the 50 million dollar stabilization agreement with the United States for six months.

Dr. Hu Shih, Ambassador to the United States: Address before the Merchants' Association, New York, October 24, 1940

... a few explanations why China cannot and will not give up the fight.

In the first place, China cannot give up the fight now because giving up the fight now means complete surrender of our national independence and freedom for which we have been fighting all these forty months. The best example for China is the surrender of France and China does not wish to suffer the same fate as France is now suffering.

¹ See *D A F.R.*, III, p. 243-5.

² See *D. S. Bul*, VI, p. 264.

. . . we cannot stop before we have finally won our national independence and freedom.

In the second place, we know very well that the aggressors cannot be appeased because they are insatiable. Surely you have not forgotten the peace of Munich in September 1938.

. . . No real peace in the Far East is possible because a peace today in the Far East will have to be a second Munich and, in all probability, a much worse Munich. No statesman in the world today will dare to sponsor such a Far Eastern Munich; and neither the Chinese Government nor the Chinese people will accept it.

In the third place, China's surrender or collapse today will mean a great catastrophe in the larger world struggle of democracy against totalitarian aggression. You have read of the new Triple Alliance¹ signed only a month ago in Berlin, which clearly and conclusively tells you that Japan and Germany and Italy are military allies. It is only China's three years of fighting which has so greatly weakened and disabled Japan that she is no longer free nor fully capable to render effective assistance to her European partners in aggression. As Major George Fielding Eliot has recently said:

When we think of Britain fighting the battle of freedom, we sometimes forget that the Chinese too are fighting that battle and have been fighting it most gallantly for more than three years. The forces of aggression that China is resisting have now joined together with the forces of aggression that Britain is resisting and that we are preparing to resist.

Our surrender at this moment, therefore, will release those forces of aggression in the East and enable them not only to loot and plunder whenever they please, but also to turn the scale against the democratic powers now engaged in the life and death struggle for human decency and international order.

For these reasons China still fights on.

China Fights On, Release from Chinese Embassy,
Washington, 1940, p. 4-6.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: Address at the Inaugural Meeting of the People's Political Council, Chungking, March 1, 1941

. . . We find ourselves at this historic point of time possessed of prestige won in more than three years of bloody warfare, and charged with responsibility heavier than ever before. For the past ten years China

¹ The Three-Power Pact between Germany, Italy, and Japan, signed at Berlin, September 27, 1940 (*D.A.F.R.*, III, p. 304).

has been repeatedly warning the world that the maintenance of world peace depends upon the restraint of Japanese aggression. Because the warning went unheeded, the world has been plunged into the present ocean of calamity. When China took up arms in solitary opposition to the Japanese militarists' formidable power and succeeded in pinning down forces of which they might otherwise have made predatory use elsewhere in the Pacific, she was playing the part of prophetic leader in the cause of peace and at the same time was the vanguard of action to vindicate that cause. That is now an evident fact. The world has awarded us its sympathy and confidence, and our relations with countries sharing interests in common with us have been rendered closer. Chinese resistance has ceased being isolated and unilateral, becoming rather a pivotal factor in world security and order. Under these fresh circumstances, I ask all you Councillors to carry your efforts a step farther, keeping before your minds a clear conception of the great goal to be attained.

Let me describe that goal. Firstly, resistance must issue in victory, in the final victory that will smash the "New Order for Eastern Asia" together with the "New Order for 'Greater' Eastern Asia." Our standpoint has never shifted: we intend to fight Japanese aggression to the point of exhaustion, restore the integrity of our territorial sovereignty and permit ourselves no rest until the day of the extinction of the Japanese militarists' ability to threaten the peace of the world. There is no room for compromise with our present antagonist. Secondly, national reconstruction must give the country such defensive preparedness as can guarantee it absolute security.

The Three People's Principles¹ demand a state with solid provision for national defense, with developed democratic institutions and a prosperous livelihood for its whole people. The Principles conceive of national defense as having only the protection of the state as its object; it cannot possibly conflict with the people's authority and livelihood which indeed it exists to safeguard. Today our national strength is making rapid strides and the international situation seems entirely favorable to us; but in order to win the final victory, respond to the demands of our part in world affairs and fully acquit ourselves of our weighty responsibilities, we have yet to work for the thorough awakening of our people to the realities of their position. Our past efforts, we must realize, are inadequate in the face of the needs of today and tomorrow. The completion of our national defenses is an indispensable prerequisite for

¹ For explanation of these principles — *San Min Chu I*, see Linebarger, Paul M. A., *The China of Chiang K'ai-shek* (World Peace Foundation, 1941), p. 250.

the completion of the work of national reconstruction as a whole. Therefore, all reconstructive activities at present must be subordinated to the requirements of national defense and the entire people must adopt a military cast of life.

Only the capability for self-defense can safeguard democracy, without the will to strive there can be no real democracy. Taking these maxims as a text I wish to bring forward the following views which I hope will find their way through you to the ears of my fellow-countrymen generally.

First: in matters political, all my fellow-countrymen must have their minds quite clear regarding the fact that political partisanship and ideological bias to the so-called "left" or "right" are now the outworn and useless lumber of a past age and utterly incompatible with the realities of the day. Let us face those stern realities and learn from our experience in this war to make our first aim the building of absolutely reliable national defenses. The European war has demonstrated that only nations with the will and the ability to strive can be sure of survival and avoid conquest and enslavement. A modern nation, moreover, when once conquered by an alien power finds, by reason of the present highly developed technical nature of the military art and the inexorable rigidity possible to modern methods of economic control, that it will never be able unaided to recover its lost independence. Nations conquered today are powerless ever again to assert themselves; this is a point of dissimilarity between conditions now and those obtaining twenty or thirty years ago.

Only a political system adapted to the strains of war is serviceable in this new age. A democracy unable to defend itself is a contradiction in terms. What democratic institutions remain to a conquered nation? The capital and labor alike of a conquered country belong to the conqueror, and in such a country all political opinions and programs are equally valueless. The Kuomintang is working for a republican revolution of which the aim is national salvation. It is seeking to secure for China freedom and equality of status among the nations of the world and its consistent policy is to solidify the strength of the people and build up national defense. It has always loudly declared to the public the importance of national defense and it is now leading the nation in a tremendous campaign of national self-defense such as has never before been seen. In order properly to fulfill this duty it has freed itself of all party prejudice, appealing to all citizens simply and solely for action to protect their country. It is adjusting the functioning of government with a view to raising the standard of administrative efficiency; it is

hastening the institution of local autonomy with a view to establishing a sound basis of democracy.

The postponement of the meeting of a national convention only renders the more pressing the Government's responsibility of bringing into existence a strong basic political organization of local representative machinery. The tide of events forces upon the Party an unprecedentedly heavy burden of responsibility. It has to call upon everyone to recognize the supremacy of the nation's interests and abandon old notions out of place in these days in order to make the nation a strong and unified fighting body — a China equal to the task of defending herself and vindicating justice.

The Party demands of everyone better knowledge and faith, fitter thought and action, in all that concerns national security. The very centre of national reconstruction in future must be the building up of the army and it is necessary to organize the political, economic, educational and cultural life of the nation and even private life on a war footing. On the one hand, the training of troops will be strengthened, the conscription system improved, military training rendered universal, and fighting technique raised to a higher standard; on the other hand, the people's sense for the needs of national defense will be sharpened and fighting discipline better enforced. This is the time to establish an economic basis for national defense.

Economic measures taken for this purpose now are not to be limited to the present period of resistance but carried forward until the day the nation can feel perfectly safe in its defensive preparedness. The Government must take steps to adjust production and finance, improve communications and methods of transportation, ask of the people frugality and hard work, and concentrate the country's capital resources. The Government and the people must work in unison to conserve those resources, develop war industry, raise the national power of production, extend effective control over all economic activity, nourish and stabilize the people's means to subsistence. Beyond the needs of our own defense and progress I believe that the reinforcing and development of China's economy will be of immense benefit to the whole world.

At the end of the first European war, Dr. Sun drew up an industrial plan which cannot only serve the Government well as a fundamental policy for the reconstruction of national defense, but is also, when the broadcast and longest view of affairs is taken, seen to be indispensable as a guide to future economic policy in general. Today a war of dimensions far greater than those of the last European war is in progress and it will bring about correspondingly more far-reaching changes. If at its

conclusion China can obtain modern machinery and technical skill for the development of her economic possibilities, she will be in a position to relieve the distress and chaos produced by world economic maladjustment and give the Orient a foundation for lasting peace. For this, however, to come about it is first necessary to make sure of her ability to stand the economic strains of the present time. A nation incapable of bestirring itself on its own behalf has no right to expect foreign financial and technical assistance and collaboration on a basis of equal and reciprocal advantage. We must be absolutely clear on this point.

In matters of education and culture, of private and public life, greater efforts are required to conform to this conception of the dominant needs of national defense. We must elevate the moral quality of national life, stimulate the pursuit of scientific knowledge and skill, make elementary education universally available, and encourage labor and service until every citizen is able and willing to play his full and proper part in national defense and reconstruction. Support for the wounded and relatives of the fallen, relief of distress, protection of those unable to shift for themselves, improvement of public health and physique are aspects of the work necessary for the security and soundness of the population. Without effective national defense there can be no state, no livelihood for the people.

The whole spirit of the Three Principles of the People lies in their emphasis upon national defense as the guarantee for national prosperity; it must be the focus of all policy and planning, the criterion for all political activity. The individual must restrict his personal needs as far as possible and develop his energy to the utmost. We must throw aside all out-of-date and narrow ideas of the conflicting interests of groups and reform habits of indulgence, slackness and idleness. I am convinced the nation is capable of far greater concentration of purpose and action in mobilizing and organizing its strength. At the same time it is no less imperative for us to work in the closest possible cooperation with all other countries that oppose Japanese aggression.

Looking at the world today we see vast changes going on: the moral and material life of humanity will undoubtedly be profoundly modified by them and all political and economic theories will be recast as a result. One thing, however, appears certain: that a nation must be armed and organized with modern efficiency if it is to survive, while thought and action incompatible with national fighting strength stand to be eliminated by the demands of the time. Looking at China we are aware of her excellent natural advantages, the fighting spirit of her people, and the generous aid and sympathy for her cause extended by countries

friendly to her. Japan we see internally exhausted and externally menaced on all sides. Our national future may be said to be richly promising. The key to victory, however, remains in our ability to grasp the new realities and make new efforts. On this occasion of the Council's meeting I have given you this account of my beliefs in the hope that this session will work with a due sense of the present state of world affairs and national needs, contributing to the best of its ability to national leadership to the end of final victory by the completion of the task of building up national defense

China Quarterly, Spring, 1941.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: Message to Friendly Nations on the 4th Anniversary of the Outbreak of War with Japan, July 7, 1941

... As things stand today the war in the Far East is no longer to be viewed as merely a conflict between two nations, for the European and Asiatic Wars have now become closely interrelated. Scarcely a single country remains unaffected because this predatory group of powers excludes no country from the scope of its design to dominate the world by force. So much has become quite clear. A mighty conflagration is sweeping the world and, after the nature of fire, it will continue to burn up all in its path until, and unless, it is extinguished. To control this ghastly evil the only course is to strike down the flame while there is yet time. As to how this is effectively to be done I have three points to make.

Firstly: every fire has a starting point, and the historical force of this present world-wide war was undoubtedly Japan's attack on our North-eastern Provinces launched in total disregard of all treaty obligations. By that act of aggression a decade ago Japan displayed the course upon which she was bent. Later in 1936 she lent fresh impetus to the forces of aggression with the Anti-Comintern Pact¹ she was then foremost in cementing. She was obviously resolved to see the world plunged into chaos. Within the past year she had entered into a tripartite alliance with Germany and Italy² and subsequently announced her conception of an order for "Greater East Asia" under her hegemony, formally declaring the terms to embrace Oceania. As such, to the expansion of her power southward she has established naval bases on Hainan Island and in Indo-China. Japan has thus been outstandingly instrumental in magnifying the scale of the war, in finessing the plan she was the first to make. She is to be regarded as more than the villainous originator of

¹ For text see *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 199.

² *Ibid.*, III, p. 304.

the Far Eastern War.¹ She is responsible for the universal character of the strife we now see spreading over the earth. Until this final flame of the evil is backed up there can be no hope of permanent peace for mankind at large.

Secondly: the issue of the conflict will depend upon the efficiency with which the forces working against aggression can make themselves felt. Asia is the center of the globe's greatest masses of population and of its richest resources. If, therefore, the democracies of Asia, America and Europe can truly concentrate their energies in the pursuit of their common endeavor against the aggressors their cooperation can ensure victory and the destruction of the powers devoted to the rule of force. Let the nations concerned with the various territories that compose the Pacific land areas make a revolutionary change in their attitude and view the importance of the Pacific with fresh insight. Then they will realize that the Ocean and the Continent of Asia will have at least equal importance with the Atlantic and Europe and the urgency of the task of crushing the power of Japan will appear to them proportional to the gravity of the situation in Europe. China has fought four years of grueling war as much for the good of the world as for her own. The nations friendly to her should regard it as imperative both for the protection of their own interests and for the sake of the world's future that a turn be put to the outrageous depredations of Japan. That done, Asia, America, Australia and Africa can bring their combined weight to bear on the enterprise of imposing a settlement of the European hostilities. If they wishfully think the Japanese may experience a change of heart and suppose it safe to let them have their way for the time being, they will find their error as disastrous as the policy of appeasement pursued until recently by European countries toward Germany. If they conceive it possible to distinguish between the Axis Powers and Japan, shrinking at the former and letting the latter have rein, the consequences are likely to be shocking. I am convinced that no democratic country can afford to view with unconcerned perspective the fierce flames of war in Asia until they find their own territory aglow.

Thirdly: the present division of the world into two parts is perfectly clear. Japan, Germany, and Italy compose a block the sole policy and purpose of which is aggrandizement at the expense of the rest of the world. As a result all peoples, lovers of peace and freedom, have joined themselves up in an opposing front. We Chinese firmly hold that this front is potentially far stronger than the aggressors. In order to ensure

¹ For history of the conflict, see Qungley, Harold S., *Far Eastern War 1937-1941* (World Peace Foundation, 1942).

victory its strength must, however, be developed to the utmost by close cooperation with one another in the course of the life and death contest that has now begun. Your vision must not be marred by attention to trivial and merely immediate features of the situation. Indecision and vacillation must be eliminated. We must make up for lost time and wrest the initiative from the aggressors. We must not allow the latter enough time to consolidate their gains and strike with strategic advantage. It is now widely argued whether Japan would move southward or northward. Some people seem to assume that she is not in a position to strike either or both directions and will possibly devote her further efforts of aggression to attacking China alone. To my mind we must carefully guard ourselves against making any calculation based upon such arguments of assumption because the aggressors are both opportunists and aggressors and therefore are capable of sudden and unpredictable action. Any miscalculation on our part may entail grave consequences.

I would conclude by expressing a certain point of view in response to the assistance rendered China by her friends among the nations. The Chinese people will ever remember with gratitude that our neighbor Soviet Russia, America of the Western Hemisphere, and England, contending herself with the greatest adversity of circumstances, have all contributed generously to our support and resistance, thus encouraging and inspiring. The Chinese Government and People will certainly act up to the task given them for not to do so would be to fail the ideal animating their own struggle and sacrifices. At the time when resistance began I said that we were engaged in a conflict of good with evil or equity and justice with brute force. Now we hope and believe that there will be more effective collaboration between China and her friends. To dream is doom for all of us. President Roosevelt expressed it in terms of four freedoms which all humanity has the right to enjoy. It is my privilege to declare that the Chinese people in condemning the Japanese are not only with unity of purpose putting an end to Japanese aggression but also are thinking of contributing to a new world order of the future, to the civilization and prosperity of mankind. That is their great determination.

Trans-Pacific News Service.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: Message to Nation on the 10th Anniversary of the Mukden Incident, September 18, 1941

. . . Today we are full of confidence in the nations friendly to us and supremely optimistic regarding the future of the fight against the aggressors. At the same time we believe a place of high renown and honor

in the pages of human history is reserved for the part we are playing in the struggle. We intend to press forward from height to height, never losing sight of the invariable goal of our national policy. We are fighting that the independent existence of the Chinese nation may be preserved and our administrative and territorial integrity rendered secure against all such peril as now menaces it. The aim is to procure for China free and equal enjoyment of her rights and to establish an order of things in the Orient and in the world that may properly be called a just peace

Chinese News Service Press Release.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: New Year's Message Given on December 31, 1941

The purpose of the grand alliance is twofold. to win the war and to win the peace

If we sacrifice millions of men and billions of dollars to win the war, we must see to it that the peace that is to follow will long endure

. . . if we know only what we are fighting against but not what we are fighting for, we may win the war but lose the peace. To defeat the Axis is but half of the battle. To achieve a complete victory we must at least begin to look into the future, condition every thought we entertain to an international level, and direct every action we take during the war toward the ultimate goal of a just and durable peace.

The term, peace, unfortunately is often identified with the maintenance of *status quo* and not infrequently defined as the absence of violence.

. . . Even as the new war is dynamic and revolutionary, so the new peace must be dynamic and revolutionary

If peace means the absence of military combat but permits the existence of political rivalry and economic struggle, then it is an uneasy and unstable peace and a prelude to future war.

Clearly we want a peace that is not merely the maintenance of *status quo* or the absence of violence, but a peace that is dynamic because it can progressively remove symptoms and causes of international friction.

Contemporary China, I, January 26, 1942.

Wunsz King, Minister to the Netherlands Government and Chargé d'Affaires to the Belgian and Czechoslovak Governments: Letter to Dr. Hubert Ripka, Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Republic, London, regarding the Declaration Relating to the Punishment of the Crimes Committed in Territories Occupied by the Enemy, London, January 9, 1942

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Note of the 6th instant which the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs was good

enough to have addressed, in the name of the Czechoslovak Government and eight other Governments in Europe, to this Legation, inviting me to be present on the occasion of the signing of a Declaration relating to the punishment of the crimes committed in territories occupied by the enemy. A copy of the Declaration has been handed to me separately.

I now have the honor to inform you that I am instructed by my Government to accept this invitation and at the same time to make fully clear its stand in regard to the problem which forms the subject matter of the joint Declaration.

In authorizing me to participate in the ceremony at the meeting of the 13th, the Chinese Government wishes to subscribe to the principles outlined in the Declaration by which the crimes committed by the enemy occupying authorities are solemnly condemned and the authors are to be held accountable therefor, as it is also its intention to apply the same principles to the Japanese occupying authorities in China when the time comes.

In those Chinese territories at present under Japanese occupation, the Chinese people have during long years past fallen victim to the acts of barbarism and violence perpetrated by the Japanese, such as the mass murder of civilians, the willful destruction of cultural and educational institutions, the systematic endeavor to deprave the Chinese race by means of narcotic drugs, and other acts too many and too repulsive to be mentioned here.

The Chinese Government believes that the elementary principles of justice and morality cannot be vindicated unless the wrongs thus done to the Chinese people as those done to other peoples are equally dealt with according to law.

Punishment for War Crimes, A Document issued by the Inter-Allied Committee, London, H.M. Stationery Office, 1942, p. 15-16.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: Message to the Indian People on the Conclusion of His Visit to India, Calcutta, February 22, 1942

. . . Since my arrival in this country I found to my great satisfaction that there exists among the people of India a unanimous determination to oppose aggression.

China and India comprise one half of the world's population. Their common frontier extends three thousand kilometers. In the two thousand years' history of their intercourse, which has been of a purely cultural and commercial character, there has never been any armed conflict. Indeed nowhere else can one find so long a period of uninterrupted peace between two neighboring countries. This is irrefutable proof that

our two peoples are peace-loving by nature. Today they have not only identical interests but also the same destiny. For this reason they are duty bound to side with anti-aggression countries and to fight shoulder to shoulder in order to secure real peace for the whole world.

Moreover our two peoples have an outstanding virtue in common, namely the noble spirit of self-sacrifice for the sake of justice and righteousness. It is this traditional spirit which should move them towards self-negation for the salvation of mankind. It is also this spirit which prompted China to be the first to take up arms against aggression and in the present war to ally herself unhesitatingly with other anti-aggression countries, not merely for the purpose of securing her own freedom, but also for the purpose of securing justice and freedom for all.

I venture to suggest to my brethren people of India at this most critical moment in the history of civilization that our two peoples should exert themselves to the utmost in the cause of freedom for all mankind, for only in a free world could the Chinese and Indian peoples obtain their freedom. Furthermore, should freedom be denied to either China or India, there could be no real international peace.

The present international situation divides the world into two camps, the aggression camp and the anti-aggression camp. All those who opposed aggression by striving for the freedom of their country and of other countries should join the anti-aggression camp. There is no middle course and there is no time to wait for developments. Now is the crucial moment for the whole future of mankind. The issue before us does not concern the dispute of any one man or country, nor does it concern any specific questions now pending between one people and another. Any people therefore which joins the anti-aggression front may be said to be cooperating, not with any particular country, but with the entire front. This leads us to believe that the Pacific war is the turning point in the history of nationalism. The method, however, by which the peoples of the world could achieve their freedom might be different from what it used to be. The anti-aggression nations now expect that in this new era the people of India will voluntarily bear their full share of responsibility in the present struggle for the survival of a free world, in which India must play her part. The vast majority of world opinion is in full sympathy with India's aspirations for freedom. This sympathy is so valuable and so difficult to obtain that it cannot be appraised in terms of money or material and should therefore by all means be retained.

The present struggle is one between freedom and slavery, between light and darkness, between good and evil, between resistance and aggression. Should the anti-aggression front lose the war, world civiliza-

tion would suffer a setback for at least one hundred years and there would be no end of human suffering

In these horrible times of savagery and brute force, the people of China and their brethren people of India should for the sake of civilization and human freedom give their united support to the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter and in the Joint Declaration of Twenty-Six Nations, and ally themselves with the anti-aggression front. I hope they will wholeheartedly join the allies, namely, China, Great Britain, America and the Soviet Union, and participate in the struggle for the survival of a free world until complete victory is achieved and the duties incident upon them in these troubled times have been fully discharged.

Lastly, I sincerely hope and I confidently believe that our ally Great Britain, without waiting for any demands on the part of the people of India, will as speedily as possible give them real political power so that they may be in a position further to develop their spiritual and material strength and thus realize that their participation in the war is not merely aid to the anti-aggression nations for securing victory but also the turning point in their struggle for India's freedom. From the objective point of view, I am of the opinion this would be the wisest policy which will redound to the credit of the British Empire.

China at War, VIII, No. 4, April 1942, p. 59,
D.A.F.R., IV, p. 217.

Loan Agreement (in Pursuance of Act of Congress Authorizing \$500,000,000 of Financial Assistance to China), Signed in Washington by Secretary of the Treasury (Morgenthau) and Foreign Minister (Soong), March 21, 1942¹

Whereas, the Governments of the United States of America and of the Republic of China are engaged, together with other nations and peoples of like mind, in a cooperative undertaking against common enemies, to the end of laying the bases of a just and enduring world peace and securing order under law to themselves and all nations, . . .

¹ On June 2, 1942 an agreement between the United States and China on the principles applying to mutual aid in the prosecution of the war was signed by the Secretary of State and T. V. Soong, Minister for Foreign Affairs (for text see *D. S. Bul.*, VI, p. 507-9). The provisions of the agreement with China are the same in all substantial respects as those of the agreement between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain signed on February 23, 1942 (see section United Nations p. 10).

ARTICLE II. The final determination of the terms upon which this financial aid is given, including the benefits to be rendered the United States in return, is deferred by the two contracting parties until the progress of events after the war makes clearer the final terms and benefits which will be in the mutual interest of the United States and China and will promote the establishment of lasting world peace and security. In determining the final terms and benefits full cognizance shall be given to the desirability of maintaining a healthy and stable economic and financial situation in China in the post-war period as well as during the war and to the desirability of promoting mutually advantageous economic and financial relations between the United States and China and the betterment of world-wide economic and financial relations.

ARTICLE III. This Agreement shall take effect as from this day's date.

Treasury Dept., Press Service No. 30-42; *D. S. Bul.*, VI, p. 263;
D. A. F. R., IV, p. 539.

Dr. Hu Shih, Ambassador to the United States: Speech to the Radcliffe Club, Washington, March 23, 1942

. . . China is fighting Japan, in the first place, because Japan is not only reviving in this modern age the cult of emperor-worship, is not only actually restoring the monarchy in parts of China, but is solemnly undertaking on herself the "divine mission" of imposing her emperor-worship and her totalitarianism on the continent of Asia and the whole world.

China is fighting Japan, in the second place, because my people who have always regarded doubt as a virtue and criticism as a right, do not wish to be dominated by a people who condemn all thinking as dangerous.

And lastly, China is fighting Japan, because my people who have always loved peace and condemned war, cannot afford to live under the yoke of a people who have always glorified wars and always dreamed of world conquest.

Text from the Chinese Embassy, Washington.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: Broadcast to the United States on the U. S. Army Hour Program, March 31, 1942

In looking toward the future I would like every one of my listeners to realize that our Chinese people are convinced that the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter are not vague assurances and empty diplomatic phraseology, but that they are the underlying convictions to

which the peace-loving people of America are dedicated. To my mind these principles should be applied not only to America and Europe but also to all peoples and races so that freedom, justice and equality may reign the world over. For all the principles and support, both moral and material, which the Government and people of America under the leadership of President Roosevelt have given us throughout these five years of resistance, we wish to express our heartfelt appreciation.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, *All We Are and All We Have*, New York, 1942, p. 25-6.

Agreement between the United States and China on Principles Applying to Mutual Aid, June 2, 1942

[For text see *D. S. Bul*, VI, p. 507-9; for master agreement see above, p. 10]

T. V. Soong, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Speech at Yale University Alumni Luncheon, June 9, 1942

. . . I should like to name the broad objectives for which my country believes that it is fighting.

The first is political freedom for Asia. The World War of 1914, while it did not succeed fully in liberating all the nations in Europe, scarcely even touched Asia. Modern inventions have annihilated distances and multiplied contacts between nations, and the world can no longer exist peaceably half free, half enslaved, any more than, as Lincoln said, a single nation can. China is fighting for her national independence; she aspires equally for the freedom of all Asiatic nations. There are, of course, here and there certain nations which may not be ready as yet for complete self-government, but that should not furnish the excuse for colonial exploitation; the U. S. in the Philippines have furnished a notable example of disinterested temporary guardianship.

Our second objective is economic justice. Political and economic justice go together; without the one the other cannot flourish. Asia is tired of being regarded only in terms of markets and concessions, or as a source of rubber, tin and oil, or as furnishing human chattels to work the raw materials. The Atlantic Charter, first enunciated by Roosevelt and Churchill and later adopted by all the United Nations, may prove to be the Magna Carta of economic justice, which must be made a living reality.

We now know that political freedom and economic justice are by themselves illusory and fleeting except in an atmosphere of international security. It may have taken our tribal ancestors uncounted ages before

police and law courts were invented to keep order among individuals; difficult it may well be, but why must we regard as hopeless police and law courts among nations to dispense justice and enforce the defunct League of Nations, to whose tribunals we brought our case when our national life was endangered. Past failures have not dimmed our hopes that an effective world instrument to dispense and enforce justice will arise from the terrors and sufferings and sacrifices of this war, and for such an international government, China, with all other liberty-loving nations, will gladly cede such of its sovereign powers as may be required.

When I relate the aspirations of my people you will say that these are aspirations shared in a large measure by the people of the United States. Indeed, there is a fundamental identity of beliefs and interests between our two countries which should make us loyal collaborators in creating the post-war world. I know that in the outward forms and processes of democracy China has much to learn but, apart from transitional superficial differences, there is the same underlying instinctive appreciation and faith in democracy among the Chinese as among you. . . .

N.Y.T., June 10, 1942.

Madame Chiang Kai-shek: Broadcast from Chungking to America, June 13, 1942¹

On July 7th, China is entering upon her sixth year of war. You are, no doubt, wondering how our outlook has been affected by five years of intense suffering and strain. I can assure you that the Chinese people are confident of their ability to hold on in the face of apparently insuperable difficulties, if China is given the necessary equipment now. The morale of our people has been the main factor of its resolute determination never to admit defeat, but to plug on with sheer dogged resistance. Their resolution was buttressed by the belief that after the war there will be a new world society with a sure foundation of freedom, justice and equality. . . .

The people of China recognized throughout our resistance that they were fighting for freedom of body and soul . . . and this not for themselves alone. I, personally, during these years encouraged them to believe that after victory was won, the whole system would be entirely altered, that we would all be free peoples, and that nations, strong or weak, would deal fairly and squarely with each other. If our people and armies had not been induced to believe this, the war, as far as China is concerned, would have been over long ago.

¹ On the occasion of the 25th reunion of her class at Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts. See also her article "China Emergent" in *Atlantic*, May 1942.

Just pause for a moment to consider what that would have meant to the other democracies. Recently Japan conscripted all males of 19 and upward for military service in the puppet-State that she has established in Manchuria. Suppose China had not elected to fight a war of resistance or had collapsed? All the manpower of this nation of 450 million people and the resources of a country larger than the whole of Europe would have been thrown into the scale against the United Nations instead of being on their side. Even if this had not spelled defeat for the United Nations, it would certainly have lengthened the war by at least several years. At first when the Chinese people were told that there would evolve a new world order out of victory, they remembered 1931 and were skeptical. It was evident that promise did not always mean fulfillment. When the invasion of Manchuria took place, I confess that I myself was bewildered because, although China's sovereignty and territorial integrity had been guaranteed by international treaties, none of the powers signatory to those treaties took any effective action.

America, however, through Colonel Stimson warned Japan against her aggressive policy and endeavored to waken other nations to the necessity of preserving the sanctity of treaties. Diplomatic representatives of some powers loftily explained to me that their countries were only responsible for not breaking the treaties themselves; they were not international policemen. In other words, if it were someone else who'd set fire to a neighbor's building and thereby incidentally endangered your own homes nearby, it was not for you to stop him, and you were not morally obligated to do so. This *reductio ad absurdum* attitude had its tragic but logical consequences. Notwithstanding the Manchuria disillusionment, China's leaders urged our people to fight on, assuring them that a new era of international justice was certain to come when victory was won. Upon that, I personally staked all my hopes of being of service to my country in the future. Consequently, if after the war the world is allowed by the democracies to relapse to the outworn ideology and system of the past, the Chinese Army and the people will feel that I have misled them and that they have suffered and bled and died in vain. They will contend, and rightly, that those of us who believed in the democracies and who have given assurance of a better order had deceived them, in which case we shall not be able to justify ourselves before our own consciences. We hope and believe that we shall not be called upon to face the charge. To err is human, and who is not human? To progress, however, we must acknowledge and rectify our past mistakes and not repeat them.

Let me continue to be frank with you. What we here must have in

the new era is a concrete implementation of the principles we uphold . . . not empty slogans. We must not allow our fervor to exterminate aggression and willingness to make sacrifices for the common cause to subside after victory is won. There must be international policemen, just as in ordinary life there are policemen to see that lawbreakers are brought to justice. Nations who break the laws should be no less liable and subject to punishment, and it is a duty of every nation to participate in active maintenance of peace and order.

Unless nations which are offenders are brought to book, they will repeat their crimes whenever opportunity offers, and the world will be compelled to undergo an endless succession of devastating wars. Gangsterism does not change its nature because the gangster is a nation instead of an individual, and it should be similarly dealt with. After all that China has sacrificed for the common cause, it is certain that those who believe in impartial justice will insist upon her having an effective voice at the after-victory peace conference in the remodelling of a new world system. As she was first to take up arms against aggression, her advice and experience will be of value when the implementation of the principles for which we are fighting comes to be discussed, and the new international machinery set up. In this new world society, we must all be, indeed, our brother's keeper and act accordingly; then stronger nations will help the weaker, not patronizingly as before, but as elder brothers in whom trust can be felt, guiding the younger ones until they are able to stand on their own feet.

I recall that Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the Father of the Chinese Republic, said that all the world's races started from the same level and that it is a moral duty of those more advanced to help those not so far advanced. Child prodigies seldom succeed in after-life to achieve the distinction in a broader world that they had received in the narrow sphere of home and school. Nations, similarly, will not succeed, whatever their potentialities, unless they harness their abilities not for self-seeking but for the common good. The time has passed when we can determine a man's status or his nation by the color of his skin or the shape of his eyes. We must create a world society to fit the needs and requirements of all races, instead of adopting the Procrustean method of lopping off a nation's territories and liberties to fit that nation into the existing order.

I have faith that from the crucifixion experienced in this war, democracies will learn the lesson that prevention is better than cure, that it is better to prevent wars than to win wars. But war can only be prevented if world society is so constituted that all races are given opportunity to

develop their latent genius, not hampered but aided by the stronger and more advanced races.

It is paradoxical but true that nations, like individuals, can all permanently enjoy privileges and rights if they are willing to share them with others. If they attempt to reserve them solely for themselves, they will lose them. History has demonstrated this time and again. Exploitation, imperialism and all the other anachronisms of pre-war world society must be swept out of existence. Therein you can render invaluable help. Hundreds of my American friends have written me, asking how they could be of service to China and to me. I shall answer you now: You could most help China and the world by martialling all your power and influence to see to it that America helps to confer upon all races the freedom, the justice and equality that America herself enjoys. You will thus also help me . . . because this is the vision I have held out to our people. . . .

Columbia Broadcasting Company through the kindness of
Wellesley College Library.

Dr. Hu Shih, Ambassador to the United States: Address at Commencement, Wellesley College, June 15, 1942¹

. . . I believe that the United Nations have a better chance to win the peace this time than the last time. . . . the task is tremendous and over-optimism may be unwarranted. Much remains to be done by all of us in order to prepare ourselves and our fellow-men for the great task ahead. . . .

. . . if we wish to win the peace after this war, much clear thinking will be necessary. For there will surely be a great deal of prejudice for you to help to break down and there will be a great deal of loose and irresponsible thinking for you to help combat. It will be your duty as the youngest members of the intelligentsia baptized by blood, tears and sweat, to help to clear the atmosphere and pave the way for constructive and idealistic statesmanship in the future.

Let me give you an example of the kind of prejudiced and loose thinking which has paralyzed and will continue to paralyze all effective efforts in constructive international planning. I refer to the deep-rooted prejudice against the use of "force" as the necessary element for the enforcement of peace and order. . . .

The new world order which we want to see set up after this terrible war must be a "League to Enforce Peace." It must be an international organization based upon the principle of a threat of overwhelming power

¹ See also "Peace Has to Be Enforced" in *Asia*, May 1942.

to prevent aggressive wars. It must command a sufficient amount of internationally organized and internationally supported force for the effective enforcement of its own law and judgment.

In short, we want a new world order which will devote its first efforts to the organization of the economic and military power of the post-war world for the effective enforcement of international peace and order. All other ornamental things such as "international intellectual cooperation" can wait. First things must come first.

I was very happy, therefore, to read the Memorial Day speech of your Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles,¹ in which he declared that after this war, the United Nations should undertake "the maintenance of an international police power" until a permanent system of general security is fully established. Such a statement of policy by a responsible official of the American Government, I am sure, will be supported by all peace-loving nations.

But, let me warn you, there will be strong opposition to such proposals as "an international police power" or "a league to enforce peace." Much of the opposition will surely be forthcoming from well-meaning pacifists with strong prejudices against the use of force as a necessary means for the enforcement of peace.

It is, therefore, important for all of us to help break down such prejudiced thinking and to help create an intellectual atmosphere favorable to the understanding and acceptance of an effective and durable peace. We must remember that an unanalyzed prejudice may obstruct and paralyze much constructive thinking and planning and may defeat and nullify the great efforts and sacrifices of millions of people the world over.

We must learn to think that there is nothing essentially evil in force which is but another name for the power or energy necessary for doing work or achieving ends; that force is only an instrument which, if properly controlled and directed, can become the very cornerstone of justice and order; and that all law, all peace and order, internal or international, are empty words if they cannot be effectively enforced by the organized power of the community. We must remember these wise words uttered by the French philosopher Pascal almost three hundred years ago:

"Justice without force is impotent.

Force without justice is tyrannical.

We must, therefore, combine justice with force."

Through the kindness of Wellesley College Library.

¹ For text see *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 71.

Department of State: Press Release on Extraterritoriality, Washington, October 9, 1942

[See section United States, p. 120.]

British Foreign Office: Statement on Extraterritoriality Rights, London, October 10, 1942

[See section United Kingdom, p. 263]

T. V. Soong, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Address at Carnegie Hall, New York, October 10, 1942

... There is no question for the Chinese as to China's future.

To beat off the Japanese we have fought and endured for five years; it may well take us another five years, but the common people of China as well as their leaders do not even think of defeat.

We know that any people with resources and manpower can — at a price to their civilization — become militarily strong. We remember that we, like other nations, have at times been the world's best soldiers, best manufacturers, best inventors, and that we are going through a national renaissance as well as a war.

But we do not want military power; after victory we want lasting peace

Because this new China has suffered more from aggression than perhaps any other nation still free — because it does feel its own potential strength — because as the newest convert to democracy the democratic dream is strong within us — we want to do something now so that the society of the future will not have to be an armed camp.

From this stems the natural desire of China to see set up, as quickly as possible, an Executive Council of the United Nations, and to help to evolve therefrom a workable world order, an international instrument fully capable of dispensing justice and enforcing law and order among nations during, as well as after, the war.

We know from bitter experience that no forward planning — post-war or otherwise — is worth the effort unless a realistic machinery for collective security — for freedom from fear — can be developed and be actually working before this war ends and while the pressures of war make it possible for such cooperation to catch hold.

The ghost of the League of Nations does not daunt us Chinese. We have thought perhaps the most about its failure because we were the first and the most grievous victim of that failure. It was on the rock of the Manchurian incident — at which time I was charged by my Gov-

ernment with the direction of our foreign policy — that the League foundered, and this war began — for you as well as for us.

But we know that the League failed for a very concrete reason — because the two great powers which controlled it and could prevent action by it did not believe it was necessary for their own security.

This is not the situation today.

Today those powers which did not feel the League useful to safeguard their own security, and you who felt it even less necessary for your own security, have to recognize that international order and collective security have become essential for the survival of strong states as well as the preservation of weaker ones. Today an aggressor left alone in his preparations can get a death jump on a strong state as well as a weak one.

A second difference from the League — is that this time we can form our international society while we are still fighting the war.

Undoubtedly much of the trouble with the League was that it was formed after and not during the first World War when the Allied Nations no longer had to find answers to the thousand and one reasons why men do not want to cooperate. Men learn to cooperate only by having to do it and the only time when they will practice at it is when they doubt whether they can survive if they don't.

The new world order, like the Chinese Republic, and like all human institutions, will never be realized until we start it. And we shall never be more ready for starting it than now. Under the impact of the terror, the sacrifices and the suffering we are undergoing, we are seeing more clearly than ever before, and perhaps more clearly than we ever shall again, the crying necessity of a new world order. If we cannot compose our differences now with all that we hold dear at stake, what chances are there later when exhaustion, mutual recriminations and cynicism at the end of the war paralyze common action.

We cannot oppose to the onward surge of the Nazis and the Japanese a mere negative attitude, the vindication of the Nine-Power Pact, the defense of the *status quo* of the British Empire, or the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union and of the United States. We must give to our young men who are called on to sacrifice a flaming mission of a new world order and begin to make that mission come true now. Against a fanatic faith in supermen, we must oppose a revolutionary enthusiasm for common men.

We are in the midst of a war more terrible, more all-embracing than the last, and to the millions of the Chinese and Russian dead will be added millions of American and British dead before we are through. Are these to die in vain; after victory will we have nothing better to

offer our peoples than universal exhaustion to be followed in a few years by still another war? Or shall we not begin at once, here and now, to make what will prove to be the great advance in human history, the emergence of a world order?

China has known the depth of suffering; she means not only to win, but to keep her arms bright after the war.

Through Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek she pledges those arms to her comrades of this war to be used, not in furtherance of nationalistic ambitions, but to help uphold the new world of justice and freedom

Text from the Chinese Embassy, Washington.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: Speech at Chungking, October 11, 1942

Korea must be free and independent. The final goal against aggression and war is the freedom and equality of all races

The Chinese Embassy, Washington.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: Telegram to the President of the United States (Roosevelt), October 13, 1942

On the occasion of the thirty-first anniversary of the Republic of China the entire nation rejoiced that the United States has made a voluntary move to relinquish extraterritorial rights in China.¹ Furthermore, the ringing of the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall to commemorate China's Liberty Day finds resounding echoes in every Chinese heart of good will and friendship for America. These tributes will do more to uphold the morale of our people in continuing resistance than anything else could possibly do. I personally am so deeply moved by this beautiful and touching gesture that I cannot find words adequate to express my feelings. As a boy the very words Liberty Bell and Independence Hall fired my imagination and made a profound and lasting impression in my mind. Throughout my struggle to secure national freedom for China I have continuously dreamed of the day when she would assume the full stature of an independent and democratic nation. Today this ideal has been realized. From the bottom of my heart, I thank you for your superb and inspired leadership and moral courage in assisting China to gain equality among the United Nations. I assure you that China shall not fail you in our joint task of securing freedom for all mankind.

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 839.

¹*D. S. Bul.*, VII, p. 805. A reply telegram was sent by the President on October 16 (*ibid.*).

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: Address at the Closing of the First Plenary Session of the Third People's Political Council, Chungking, October 31, 1942

... One of the deepest causes for gratification we and our fellow-countrymen find in recent events is, of course, the abolition of the unequal treaties. In this respect there is nothing specific to report at present but I wish to stress the importance of the fact that Great Britain and the United States should have spontaneously made this proposal with such sincerity of intention that an entirely satisfactory outcome of the negotiations is already assured us in principle. I believe the essential thing at the moment is how after we have gained equality of status with other nations we are to exert ourselves and not fall short of our allies' expectations of us or fail worthily to play the part of a modern and independent nation. Consider how momentous an episode in the history of the nation is this deliverance from the shackles that have bound it for a hundred years. All of you here today from the oldest to the youngest member have without exception grown up out of a period of repeated national humiliations.

Dr. Sun Yat-sen, father of the Republic, made it his great aim in his revolutionary leadership to secure freedom and equality of status for China among the nations of the world. The Principle of Nationhood had first to be realized before obstacles to the solutions of problems involved the application of the Principles of Democracy and Livelihood could be removed. The vindication of our national honor has been the unvarying demand of the whole Chinese people alike, of those who were and were not actually concerned with the work of the Revolution. Now the way is open to that goal and the occasion calls for a proper sense of its unique importance on the part of every citizen. Let us look back over the history of the nation's sufferings since the establishment of the Republic and to the time of the Northern Expedition that put an end to the civil wars waged by the militarists. In 1927 the world began to understand China and if it had not been for trouble at home and menace from without the unequal treaties would have been abolished long ago. Half of the obstacles were due to mischief done by the Japanese Imperialists and half to pretexts founded upon our own lack of unity. The present success is the result of more than five years of war. Now we must go on to display with firmer solidarity and greater effort our full comprehension of the stages by which the Revolution has been advancing and concentrate our will and activity upon victory in resistance and the complete application of the Three Principles of the People. This is the first point I hope you will endeavor to bring to your fellow-countrymen's notice.

Having now attained equality of status with our allies and other nations of the world, we must shoulder the responsibilities this age has laid upon us. The nation is responsible not only for its own interests but also for those of the world. No difficulties or sacrifices must deter us from the fulfillment of our duties as one unit of the forces of the United Nations and after the war we must be prepared as a progressive and free nation devoted to the cause of justice to do all that is required of us in collaborating with those nations to recreate world order and effect the deliverance of mankind. China is the largest and most ancient of Asiatic countries but it is not for us boastfully to talk of her right to a position of "leadership" among those countries. In the spirit of the saying "all men are brothers" we shall rather regard it as our responsibility to treat the peoples of Asia, like all suffering and oppressed humanity elsewhere, as equals and to help and support them. Recognizing equality as the highest guiding principle of international affairs, we shall do well neither to underestimate nor overestimate our own importance and dignity. It is precisely Japanese militarism with its ambition of dominating Asia under the pretense of organizing a "Co-prosperity Sphere for Greater East Asia" that constitutes the universal enemy we are determined to crush.

We have been fighting this war of resistance with purity of motive and consistency of principle — not for any selfish purpose but for the salvation of the world through first saving ourselves. Towards Asia as towards the whole world we wish only to do our duty to the exclusion of any lust for power or other desires incompatible with the moral dictates of love and benevolence that are characteristic of the Chinese national spirit. The aim of the Revolution is, so far as the interests of China herself are concerned, the restoration of her original frontiers and in regard to the rest of the world a gradual advance of all nations from the stage of equality to that of an ideal unity. Such is the full extent of our desire. Every citizen should take stock of his country's position. The Washington conference made China one of the four main powers and that was an expression of the high regard in which our allies hold us, yet the degree to which our national reconstruction and strength are inadequate in comparison with other powers must fill us with a sense of unworthiness. With the continual and fierce development of hostilities we must go about the discharging of our responsibility toward the world by building up our own strength and intensifying our preparations for a general counter-offensive. In the present period we must stand firm, permit ourselves no vainglorious thoughts or rashness and never slacken in our vigilance.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek: Message to the New York Herald Tribune Forum on Current Problems, November 17, 1942

... There will be neither peace, nor hope, nor future for any of us unless we honestly aim at political, social and economic justice for all peoples of the world, great and small. But I feel confident that we of the United Nations can achieve that aim only by starting at once to organize an international order embracing all peoples to enforce peace and justice among them. To make that start we must begin today and not tomorrow to apply these principles among ourselves even at some sacrifice to the absolute powers of our individual countries. We should bear in mind one of the most inspiring utterances of the last World War, that of Edith Cavell:

“Standing at the brink of the grave, I feel that
Patriotism alone is not enough.”

We Chinese are not so blind as to believe that the new international order will usher in the millennium. But we do not look upon it as visionary. The idea of universal brotherhood is innate in the catholic nature of Chinese thought; it was the dominant concept of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, whom events have proved time and again to be not a visionary but one of the world's greatest realists.

Among our friends there has been recently some talk of China emerging as the leader of Asia, as if China wished the mantle of an unworthy Japan to fall on her shoulders. Having herself been a victim of exploitation, China has infinite sympathy for the submerged nations of Asia, and towards them China feels she has only responsibilities — not rights. We repudiate the idea of leadership of Asia because the “Fuehrer principle” has been synonymous for domination and exploitation, precisely as the “East Asia co-prosperity sphere” has stood for a race of mythical supermen lording over grovelling subject races.

China has no desire to replace Western imperialism in Asia with an Oriental imperialism or isolationism of its own or of any one else. We hold that we must advance from the narrow idea of exclusive alliances and regional blocs which in the end make for bigger and better wars, to effective organization of world unity. Unless real world cooperation replaces both isolationism and imperialism of whatever form in the new interdependent world of free nations, there will be no lasting security for you or for us.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, *All We Are and All We Have*, New York, 1942, p. 66-7.

VI. OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

1. CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Czechoslovakia was a Republic with a constitutional form of government. It lost territory as a result of the Munich Conference of September 29, 1938, of Polish demands on October 1, 1938, and of Hungarian demands on November 2, 1938. The name of the country was changed to Czecho-Slovakia and three autonomous governments were set up: Bohemia and Moravia, Slovakia and Carpatho-Ukraine. On March 14, 1939, the German army invaded Bohemia and on March 16, 1939 Hitler declared that Czecho-Slovakia had ceased to exist. The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia was set up under a Reich Protector. German troops subsequently entered Slovakia. Hungary invaded and annexed Carpatho-Ukraine.

Following the Munich Conference, Dr. Eduard Beneš resigned as President of Czechoslovakia. On September 3, 1939, at the outbreak of the war between the United Kingdom and Germany, Dr. Beneš declared from London that the people of Czechoslovakia were at war with Germany. He set up a Provisional Czechoslovak Government in Paris.

1939

- Oct. 2 An agreement was signed with France, relative to the formation of Czechoslovak army units in France.
- Nov. 17 The Czechoslovak National Committee, composed of eight members, was formed with Dr. Beneš as President. It was recognized by France as qualified "to represent the Czechoslovak peoples" and specifically to make arrangements for the Czechoslovak army in France. The National Committee stated that Czechoslovakia still existed as an independent state and announced that it would keep in touch with the new Polish Government-in-Exile with the view to cooperation in the future reconstruction of Central Europe.
- Dec. 2 Mobilization ordered of Czechoslovak citizens in all parts of the world.
- " 20 Official recognition of the National Committee by the United Kingdom Government.

1940

- Feb. 18 Recognition of the National Committee by the Union of South Africa.
- Jun. 22 The National Committee moved to London and the Czechoslovak army was evacuated from France to England.
- Jul. 21 The Czechoslovak Council of State was created by Presidential decree to serve as a Parliament controlling finances and advising the Government. The National Committee ceased to exist as such, its members continuing their activities as members of the Cabinet.
- " 23 The National Committee recognized by the United Kingdom Government as the Provisional Government of Czechoslovakia, with Dr. Beneš as its President.

1940

- Oct. 9 Mutual support and friendship with Polish Government pledged.
- Oct. 25 Military agreement with United Kingdom signed.¹
- Nov. 11 Joint Declaration by the Czechoslovak and Polish Governments concerning close military and political cooperation during the war and in the peace settlement.
- Dec. 11 State Council formed
- “ 12 Financial agreement with the United Kingdom.

1941

- Jul. 18 The Provisional Government recognized by the United Kingdom Government as the legal Government of the Czechoslovak Republic.
- “ “ Agreement with U.S.S.R. signed in London covering the immediate exchange of Ministers, mutual aid in the war and the constitution of Czechoslovak military units in Russia under a Czechoslovak commander.²
- “ 31 Formal recognition accorded by the United States.
- Sept. 2 Recognition by the Chinese Government.
- “ 24 Joint Declaration with Poland of intention to cooperate during the war and in the making of peace.³
- “ 27 Military agreement with the U.S.S.R.
- Nov. 5 Joint Declaration by Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia and Poland at the International Labor Conference, New York City (see p. 414).
- Dec. 16 Declaration of a state of war with Japan and with “all countries at war with Great Britain, Russia and the United States.”
- “ — Reconstruction of the Government It now consists of eight Czechs and six Slovaks under the premiership of Monsignore Jan Šrámek, a Czech.

1942

- Jan. 13 Declaration on punishment for war crimes signed.
- “ 14 Joint Declaration by Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia and Poland on the Central and Eastern European Planning Board.
- “ 23 Agreement with Poland outlining fundamental principles and procedures for a federation.
- Mar. 26 Re-establishment of diplomatic relations with Mexico.
- Jun. 12 V. M. Molotov during his stay in London personally reaffirmed to President Beneš that the Soviet Union recognized the legal continuity of the pre-Munich boundaries of the Republic, not merely in Sude-tenland and Slovakia but also in Ruthenia.
- “ 17 The Government announced that they were making all necessary arrangements for setting up courts after victory to try all Nazis responsible for the massacre of Czechoslovaks.
- Jul. 11 Mutual aid agreement between the United States and Czechoslovakia.⁴

¹ See *I-A.R.*, 1941, I, 1, p. 5; *The Times*, October 26, 1940.

² For text see *I-A.R.*, 1941, I, p. 5.

³ For text see Great Britain *Foreign Office*. Misc No. 3 (1941), Cmd. 6315.

⁴ See section United Nations for text of master agreement, p. 10.

1942

Aug. 5 Exchange of notes with the United Kingdom in which it was agreed that in post-war settlement of frontiers, the Munich Agreement would be completely disregarded.¹

Sept. 29 French National Committee renounced Munich Agreement.

Oct. 7 State Council reappointed.

Nov. 13 Cabinet reorganized.

" 28 The Prime Minister informed the State Council, on behalf of the Government in London, that Dr. Beneš' term of office had been prolonged, by a declaration in accordance with Czechoslovak constitutional law.

Eduard Beneš, President: Message to Neville Chamberlain, British Prime Minister, September 3, 1939²

At this moment in which the British people are obliged to wage a war imposed on Poland, Great Britain and France, by Nazi Germany, I wish to express, with the deep and unalterable feelings of sympathy, the desire and the decision of the Czechs and Slovaks to join, without hesitation, your people in this struggle for a free Europe. Our country is invaded and occupied by armed forces of Nazism and the whole nation is suffering under inhuman terror and oppression. Its forces, however, both moral and physical, remain intact. We Czechoslovak citizens consider ourselves as being also in war with the German military forces, and we shall march with your people till the final victory and liberation of our Fatherland.

British War Aims, p. 6.

Eduard Beneš, President: Speech to the Cardiff Business Club, Cardiff, Wales, March 1, 1940

I do not intend to deal in detail with the future peace; I only wish to stress that this new system of European solidarity means for me —

- (1) the freedom of the small Central European nations;
- (2) new federal units in different parts of Europe;
- (3) the rebuilding of the League of Nations system, in order better to correspond to the post-war situation than was the case with

¹ Great Britain, *Foreign Office Treaty Series*, No. 3 (1942), Cmd 6379.

² *British War Aims*, p. 6, n. 1. The British Government formally recognized the Czechoslovak National Committee on December 20, 1939. For text of letters exchanged between President Beneš and Lord Halifax, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, see *British War Aims*, p. 35-6.

the League of Nations in the last few years, and to render possible at least a relative limitation of armaments;

- (4) a new system of economic collaboration which would render impossible the economic conflict between the democracies and the autarchical totalitarian States.

Australia, *C.N.I.A.*, XII, No. 7,
June 1, 1942, p. 212.

Joint Declaration by the Polish Government and the Provisional Czechoslovak Government, London, November 11, 1940

[For text see section Poland, p. 452.]

Hubert Ripka, Secretary of State: Comment on the Polish-Czechoslovak Declaration, November 11, 1940

An international new world order will be based on the free association which will arise, not only in Western Europe, but in the Vistula-Danubian area as well. The Czechoslovaks and Poles, in particular, are vitally interested in reaching the closest possible political association, to which other nations could be added.

New Europe, February 1941, p. 77; see also
The Times, November 12, 1940, p. 3

Hubert Ripka, Secretary of State: Statement on Central European Federation, December 5, 1940

In all present considerations concerning the future organization of Central Europe, it should not be forgotten that we still lack certain important elements necessary for forming our judgment, so that all our present plans of organization must of necessity be limited to outlines of a fairly general character. . . .

When speaking here of the reconstruction of Central Europe we have in mind the nations living in a zone stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic, Aegean, and Black Seas. It is a zone directly bordering on three great powers: Germany, Italy, Russia. The predominance of these powers bears to a greater or lesser extent upon the individual small nations of this area. If they are to be freed from the pressure exercised upon them by these great powers, it is essential:

- (1) that they should be mutually linked one with another so as to ensure thus their independence and security;

(2) that from their closer confederation should be excluded the direct participation of any of those three great powers, otherwise the smaller States would fall into power-political dependence on it;

(3) that their closer confederation should be incorporated into a wider all-European federation which should settle the political relations between the great powers of Europe;

(4) that their association should not be hostilely pointed against any power except one which threatened their freedom and security.

It is necessary to ask whether it is expedient that all the nations of this area should unite in a single common confederation. If we regard the excessive extent of this zone, it immediately appears very difficult to see that the Greeks should feel an especially close community of interests with the Poles or Czechoslovaks. And if the federal status is to rest on solid and firm foundations there is no doubt that in addition to a community of material interests (economic interests, communications, trade and technical interests) it is essential that amongst those who unite in such an association there should exist a lively consciousness of the community of their political destinies and of the usefulness of their closer collaboration. For these reasons it may be considered more suitable that in the Baltic-Aegean zone only those nations should be united in a confederation that have a closer community of political and economic interests. . . .

So long as it is not possible to see clearly the further tendencies of political development and the political and social consequences of this war it is possible, in my opinion, usefully to consider only the following variants of Central European reconstitution:

1. Either the co-existence of a Polish-Baltic federation, a Danubian federation (including Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, and Rumania) and a Balkan federation (which would include Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Turkey, Greece, and Albania); the three formations being linked by a closer political bond between Poland and Czechoslovakia on the one hand, and between Rumania and Yugoslavia on the other.

2. Or a Polish-Czechoslovak union which would form the point of crystallization for a Polish-Danubian federation, just as around the Yugoslav-Turkish union would be created a Balkan confederation in which Rumania could serve as a binding link between the two formations. In this combination it would be necessary to consider the question whether Austria should be incorporated in the Polish-Danubian federation or remain outside it.

The discussion concerning these variants can make an essential contribution to clarifying many aspects of the problem at stake. It is nec-

essary, however, never to lose sight of the various international political eventualities which will be brought about by the further progress of the war. Especially it is necessary to note that the creation of any confederation not only implies definite international political assumptions (the relationships and interests of the nations that are to be associated), but also assumes the existence of certain internal political conditions, that is, a considerable degree of adaptation of the internal regimes of all their participants on the basis of a common political and social doctrine. It is inconceivable that liberal democratic States could confederate with collectivist or even etatist and totalitarian States, feudal States with progressive democratic and socialist States. Experience has shown the untenability of the thesis that States with opposing politico-social ideologies can live together in peace without the danger of explosive conflicts. Still less is it possible that States could unite in confederation if they supported entirely opposing principles concerning the settlement of political, economic, and social conditions. If the smaller nations of the Baltic-Aegean area are to confederate they must also agree on a common politico-social doctrine, even though its application will vary according to the cultural level and economic structure of each country. It would be an error to underestimate the difficulties which would necessarily arise from such an essential balancing and adaptation of the internal regimes of the Central European nations. It is not impossible that these difficulties may appear more formidable than those caused by the former variations of other international and political orientations. If we fail to consider from the very beginning how to overcome difficulties of this kind we shall run the danger of conceiving artificial diplomatic formulas rather than practical political plans for a Central European federation.

News Flashes from Czechoslovakia,
Release No. 59, December 9, 1940.

Eduard Beneš, President: Report of Speech at Opening of the Czechoslovak State Council in London, December 11, 1940

“The real liberation of our state and nation must take place within our own country and for our people. We here are only standard-bearers, the symbol of our people in arms. The struggle for liberation at home is being waged unanimously by all classes of the people in Bohemia. There is complete harmony between the Czechoslovak Government in London and the nation at home. Ninety per cent of the people of Slovakia are in favor of a united Republic.”

The British recognition of the Czechoslovak Government was a great political success for the Czechoslovak people, and signified the definite turning-point in their affairs since Munich. The British Government were reserving their opinion on the legal continuity of the First Republic from the point of view of international law, but this was a problem which the Czechoslovak people at home would solve and so come quickly to an agreement with Great Britain and the other States. The British Government also stated that they were not bound by any frontiers in Central Europe, and "These reservations hold not only for us, but for Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and the other states of Central Europe. In an official Note of the British Government dated November 11, I was expressly assured that the British Government do not recognize the Munich frontiers, and are not bound by them.¹ . . ."

"As in the last war all our expenses are borne by our state. We are not receiving money from anyone. We are not in the service of any foreign State. The Government, however, are taking the necessary steps to an agreement with the British Government, under which credits will be placed at the disposal of the Republic on the fall of Germany for the maintenance of people at home and for the economic reconstruction of our state."

The Times, December 13, 1940.

Eduard Beneš, President: Lecture at Rhodes House before the Masaryk Society, Oxford, England, May 24, 1941

The new European democracy must remain victorious not only on the military front but on the inner political front as well, and this principle must be carried to its consequences without compromise. This means first of all great and profound political and social changes in present-day Germany, which must come from consistent political education over a long period. This of course presupposes a completely new organization of Germany on the basis of federation, in conjunction with an entirely new organization of Central Europe and Europe generally. . . .

I consider the creation of a Federal Europe immediately after the war as impossible. For this a longer period is required. But I do not exclude this as a possible, systematically worked out program to be progressively realized in the future. Continental Europe must become really democratic, and the principle of real moral and legal equality be-

¹ See p. 253.

tween individual nations and States must be again introduced into international political practice .

Post-war Europe must have some sort of new and firm system of collective security, but this will not by itself resolve the social and economic problem . Political democracy must be completed by economic and social democracy. . . This will limit private property in many respects, but will not abolish it. . The important thing is that this new system should remain democratic and not become totalitarian, and that the principle of individual freedom should guide both in the economic and in the social realm . . . The inalienable right should be secured to the individual to remain unmolested and undisturbed in the exercise of his human privileges . .

New Europe, August 1941, p. 236.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London, Jan Masaryk, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Speech on Adoption of the Resolution, June 12, 1941

My Prime Minister has asked me to make the following declaration on behalf of the Czechoslovak Government.

We are unanimous in accepting the ideas and decisions which Mr Winston Churchill has so eloquently laid down as the irretrievable duty of all free people of Europe and the world To Great Britain the gigantic task has been allotted of guarding the freedom of the souls of the peoples, whose representatives meet here today.

The great City of London has temporarily become the capital of all the countries who for the time being are under the unsavory goose-stepping heel of the vulgar Nazi oppressors. The Czechoslovak people are almost the pioneers among the countries of Europe which have suffered aggression. Just like the citizens of the British Commonwealth of Nations, we Czechoslovaks in London, and what is more important our people at home, never doubted, not even for a minute, the ultimate deliverance from Hitler's mechanized stone age We are proud to co-operate humbly with the Governments of all our friends and Allies. We know that decency, law and Christian civilization will triumph in the end. We are grateful that kind Providence has chosen you, Sir (Churchill), to be our great and respected leader.

U K., Cmd 6285, Misc. No. 1 (1941), p. 12-13;
I-A.R., 1941, I, p. 2.

Agreement between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Czechoslovakia, Signed at London, July 18, 1941

[See section U.S.S.R., p. 353.]

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London, Jan Masaryk, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Speech on Adoption of the First Resolution¹ [Adherence to Principles of the Atlantic Charter], September 24, 1941

The Czechoslovak Government is proud to have this opportunity, with the other Allied Governments, to voice their approval of the resolution proposed by the British Government. We free Czechoslovaks, who escaped Hitler's clutches and are enjoying the hospitality of Great Britain, this last citadel of freedom in Western Europe, and of London, the capital of all the peoples who, as a result of a lack of preventive measures, have temporarily been visited by the Nazi plague, together with our innocently suffering people at home, were deeply stirred by the news of the historic meeting between the President of the United States and the British Prime Minister. The eight points which resulted from this meeting are equally important in their symbolic significance as they are in their political and economic implications. The Czechoslovak Government considers this declaration to be a most important cornerstone in the process of preparing a better world for our children and their children after the final victory.

The two great English-speaking democracies declared the final destruction of Nazi tyranny as their duty, not only to themselves but to the whole world. The people of Czechoslovakia, after centuries of experience as neighbors of Germany, were definitely convinced that any hope of a permanent agreement with Nazi Germany, this vulgarized, new edition of goose-stepping Prussianism, was an unrealizable dream. Only after the absolute annihilation of the Nazis and after unsentimental punishment of those to whom murder and destruction have become pagan religion, can we proceed to establish such a peace, that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

The Czechoslovak Government and our people at home are fully confident that the application of the high principles of the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration will be in accordance with the special circumstances

¹ See section United Nations, p. 3.

and needs of the different parts of Europe and the world. The declaration emphasizing the necessity of restoring the sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them, gives us an assurance that when victory is achieved, the vital interests and sovereign rights of Czechoslovakia will be restored and safeguarded.

The disarmament of nations who periodically resort to armed aggression in order to achieve unscrupulous, political, and territorial aggrandizement, will go a long way towards the reinstatement of decent, democratic rule on the continent of Europe. But even when total disarmament of these countries is accomplished, the defensive positions of nations who, for a long time, have been victims of aggression, will have to be considered.

The application of the eight points should result in securing such international, territorial, political, legal, military, and economic guarantees for all peace-loving peoples, but especially for the neighbors of Germany, as to enable them to defend peace for themselves and for the world against any future attempts of aggression either by Germany or anyone else.

Within the future economic structure of the world, as outlined in the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration, small nations like Czechoslovakia, by access to an equitable share of raw materials and other necessary help, must be given an opportunity as equal among equals in close cooperation with their neighbors, to reconstruct quickly and permanently their devastated economic life, thus securing improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security for all their citizens.

The Czechoslovak Government is more than ever convinced that the closer the cooperation between the British Empire and the United States of America becomes, the safer will be the future of those who, today, have taken up arms against the common foe. We make bold to express our hope that this cooperation will be especially close, efficient, and quick in giving all possible assistance to Soviet Russia, whose heroic army and population have given, and are giving, the world a shining example of bravery and patriotic fervor, the like of which has seldom been recorded in the history of humanity's struggle against evil.

The Czechoslovak Government promises, to the best of their modest ability, to cooperate with the two great Western democracies and all the Allies of Great Britain, and I have the honor of declaring the acceptance of the resolution proposed by the British Government.

Joint Polish-Czechoslovak Declaration, St. James's Palace, London, September 24, 1941

[For text see section Poland, p 464.]

Joint Declaration by the Government, Workers' and Employers' Delegates of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia, I. L. O. Conference, New York, November 5, 1941

The Government, Employers' and Workers' delegations of the Central European and Balkan countries represented at the International Labor Conference, having met and jointly reviewed the situation, have unanimously adopted the following declaration:

1. With feelings of indescribable sadness, we pay a tribute to our tormented peoples, to their unconquerable spirit, their courage and the magnitude of their sacrifices. We proclaim the solidarity of our countries in the common struggle for freedom.

2. We protest before the civilized world against the innumerable and unprecedented atrocities that are being daily committed by the invaders and their satellites. For the sole crime of remaining loyal to their country, thousands of men, women and children are subjected to the tortures of the concentration camps or are executed. The invader respects neither the laws of God nor the rights of man. We do particularly protest against the barbarous practice of taking hostages and executing them.

We send a fraternal greeting to the other oppressed nations of Europe. We pay tribute to the great and valiant peoples of the British Empire, of the Soviet Union, and to the great American nation. Our most sympathetic thoughts go also to the people of China.

3. We solemnly assure our peoples that the struggle for their liberation, carried on jointly with the world's great democracies, shall be continued untiringly until the day of victory.

4. In pursuing this struggle we count on the help and wholehearted support of all the free nations, and above all of their organized working people. The duration of the war depends very largely on the extent to which these nations, and especially their workers, show a spirit of sacrifice.

5. The countries of Central Europe and the Balkans reaffirm their profound devotion to the democratic principle and express their solidarity with the great democracies.

6. We express the firm conviction that the peace that will follow victory will bring to our peoples, as well as to all peoples throughout the world, enjoyment of the four freedoms defined in the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration.

We hope that the end of this war, which was forced upon us, will save a hundred million inhabitants of Central Europe and of the Balkans from their present state of wretchedness by assuring them the possibility of stable employment, guaranteed by reconstruction and by the development of their industries, agriculture and that those peoples will be included within the sphere of international exchanges of goods and services. Special attention goes to the masses of the peasant population and to their social and economic standards, because it is on those elements that peace and security in that region depend. It is in this spirit that our present joint declaration has been conceived, and it is in this same spirit of frank and friendly collaboration that we conceive the part to be played by our countries in the reconstruction of a new Europe, enjoying a stable peace, with freedom and prosperity.

I-A.R., 1941, I, 10, p. 1; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 270.

Jan Masaryk, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Broadcast on the Twenty-Third Anniversary of Czechoslovak Independence, New York, November 5, 1941

Czechoslovakia is the heart of Europe. . . . Today this heart of Europe is held by Hitler and it is up to us to take it away from him. It will be done.

I have always tried to be a citizen of Europe and today I am that more than ever before. . . . I am asked daily what I think of a European Federation. I am heartily in favor of it. The Polish and Czechoslovak Governments have resolved to start the ball rolling by coming together and forming an important nucleus for the building up of a better Europe. We hope that other nations will join us in these endeavors. I feel that the united suffering has brought us all closer together. We have all learned our lesson. Only blind or bad people have not. The great mistake of all the countries in Europe after the war was the futile endeavor to make a self-sufficient economic unit out of each and every country whatever its size. It was nonsense and we are all paying a terrible price for it today. It will be the duty of the English-speaking democracies to give Europe a solid lead in the future economic development. The people

in the oppressed countries with whom I am in touch are looking to Great Britain and America to step into the breach as soon as the war is won, and knowing both Great Britain and America I know they will not be disappointed. We should not be pampered, when the war is over. We should have all the fundamental privileges that free human beings should have, but in return for that we must perform many arduous and selfless duties. . .

I am also asked what will be done with Germany after the war. That is a very large order. One thing I know: Germany must be forever stopped from periodically blacking out her soul and becoming a murdering war machine. A long period of quarantine must be imposed on a country where goose-stepping can periodically replace Goethe and Heine. . . I think that they again will become a worthy member of the concert of nations, but for the sake of Germany the periodical blackouts which every time cost millions of innocent lives will have to be stopped by all those who value freedom of the individual soul above all possessions. . .

Speeches of Jan Masaryk in America, The Czechoslovak Information Service, p. 15-17.

Eduard Beneš, President: Lecture to a Conference on the Organization of Peace at Aberdeen University,¹ November 10, 1941

. . In working out this question in detail the following considerations must be taken into account:

After the present war the following blocs will exist in Europe:

1. Western Europe, *i.e.* France on the one, and Great Britain on the other hand; Franco-British relations, and an agreement regarding Belgium and Holland.
2. Post-war Germany. Within Germany, there should be a decentralized confederation, which would break the domination of Prussia over the other elements in the German nation. Prussia herself should be divided into about three or four separate units. A return to the former confederation in a modernized form of the Reich is absolutely essential. And it is self-evident that Germany would be again restricted to her pre-1938 frontiers with possible rectifications in favor of her neighbors, if this should be demanded by considerations of European security.
3. Italy, which will perhaps be weakened — certainly in Africa and

¹ See also Dr. Beneš' article "The Organization of Post-war Europe" in *Foreign Affairs*, 1942, XX, p. 226-42.

in the Mediterranean — as a result of her Fascist participation in the Nazi Imperialistic venture.

4. The reorganization of Central Europe,¹ the core of which would certainly be a Czechoslovak-Polish Confederation. The creation of this new political unit can be considered today as an accomplished fact. This might be joined by Austria and Hungary and, possibly, by Rumania. But today one cannot pass a definite judgment on this second question. Everything will depend upon the future internal conditions of these three countries at the end of the present war. Hungary cannot, of course, maintain the territory given to her by Germany in violation of treaties as a reward for her participation in the Nazi war.

5. The Balkan bloc, which should consist of a confederation between Yugoslavia, Greece, Albania, and, possibly, Rumania. Turkey herself must decide what she will do. As to Bulgaria, one may say that the other states must definitely arrange their mutual disputes with her. I am of the opinion that, whatever happens in the Balkans during and after this war, Bulgaria should be compelled to join a future Balkan confederation. For the third time in the course of the last thirty years she has become the instrument of other Great Powers against her neighbors, the small states in the Balkans. An end must be put to this.

6. Soviet Russia, which — in spite of various plans in other directions, for instance, the so-called Pan-Europe plan — must take part in this European organization and in the cooperation between the new European blocs. A great shortcoming in the political structure of Europe after the last war lay in the fact that the Soviet Union, which was not invited to cooperate in its foundation and direction, was involved when it was already very late, in 1934, in the collective defense of this post-war system. In this way the Soviets, rightly or wrongly, felt themselves to be isolated and threatened. If Soviet Russia were again to be excluded from the organization of Europe, the new collaboration of the organized political units in Europe would lose their equilibrium through the fact that the German influence in the East would again be unduly strengthened. In addition, this would almost inevitably lead to attempts to isolate the Soviet Union from European influences.

This policy has been more than once unfavorable to the Soviet Union during the past twenty years, though it is clear that its internal pacification and economic development could be achieved more rapidly and easily with the help of the rest of Europe. But it has been still more

¹ See Dr. Beneš' article "The New Central Europe" in *Journal of Central European Affairs*, 1941, I, p. 1.

unfavorable to Europe itself. The Russian European continent belongs geographically and politically to Europe, just as do the British Isles. This is an inescapable fact. The continual disturbance of equilibrium and the exposure of Soviet Russia to isolation was one of the reasons for the second European War. And if the error were repeated, it would probably lead to a third, and still more disastrous, European and World War.

7 A larger Scandinavian political unit should be created in the north of Europe — in agreement with Great Britain and Russia. In the south-west of Europe Spain and Portugal will decide their future status for themselves.

I repeat emphatically that the just solution for Germany would be a most fateful error if Germany were permitted to retain one inch of the territories which she has secured by force. It would be a source of gratification for Hitler's Nazi policy, as it would show that force and violence are justified and can maintain themselves. And even if Hitler and his regime were to disappear irrevocably, and the military dictatorship of Prussian generals be established instead, this extension of German territory would tempt his military successors to conclude first a temporary, advantageous "German peace" and then to pursue the path of violence again, as soon as the lessons of the present war were to some degree forgotten; or even sooner, if it were to suit them. But present-day and future Germany and the whole German nation must be convinced *ad oculos*, and once and for all, that force secures nothing and leads to heavy, criminal and useless sacrifices.

I would add that force, which was certainly immoral even though it did not involve much blood, was employed in the occupation of a section of Czechoslovakian territory after the edict of Munich. As a result it is to me self-evident that Germany will have to yield up her booty of October 1938, just as all that she has acquired since, and that she will be compelled to evacuate Austria, which she overpowered by a forcible *anschluss*.

I may add that this view is not dictated by any feeling of jealousy, hostility or Germanophobia. For me political and moral considerations are alone decisive. I do not affirm that the Germans are a bad people, or that all Germans are bad. I affirm only that Germany, as a people and State, is completely responsible for the most terrible war in world history, that this theory of total war has been discussed and elaborated in Germany and in Nazi circles for more than twenty years, that the Germans as a nation and State are responsible for Hitler and Himmler, just as the Americans are responsible for Lincoln or Roosevelt, the

British for Churchill, the Italians for Mussolini, the Czechoslovaks for Masaryk, and the Russians for Lenin and Stalin . . .

The active participation of Soviet Russia in the establishment of a European equilibrium must, of course, find expression, first of all, in an agreement between the Soviets and a Czechoslovak-Polish confederation. Many unhappy memories have stood between Russia and Poland. Their past must not, however, prevent good relations in the future

. . . I would stress the fact that the nations of Central Europe must decide their fate after the war themselves; this is a self-evident democratic postulate. . . .

On the other hand, the means for establishing a new and permanent order in Central Europe is that confederation between Czechoslovakia and Poland, the basis of which we have already laid in London, and which has received the approval of the Czechoslovak and Polish peoples at home. This in itself means a political bloc, both territorially and economically, which will be sufficiently powerful for its will to be respected; if this bloc secures the enduring friendship of the U.S.S.R. — which, in view of the good will on both sides, is highly probable — this can mean a real improvement in the situation in Central and Eastern Europe for a long time to come. The participation of other interested states in this bloc would be in their own interests, and would certainly take place sooner or later. In this we have the surest road to safeguarding Central Europe against a new German invasion

. . . our final aim must be a kind of confederation of Europe as an element in some sort of world commonwealth, without which it is really impossible to conceive of a future world organization. . . .

Through the creation of larger federal blocs in Europe the solution of post-war economic problems will also be facilitated. . . .

If one or two northern and southern economic units are created in Central Europe, they will not only meet their own economic interests and needs better, but also strengthen their political stability in relation to the one-sided aspirations of this or that great state. . . .

Equally the new and audacious social policy which will be called for all over the European continent as a result of the events of this war will be made possible by the development of larger political units in Central Europe. Social progress in Czechoslovakia was handicapped by the social reaction and backwardness prevailing in several neighboring states. Even in this respect the present war will produce great changes in the Central European states and thereby notable equalizations and reconciliations. . . .

But the future European political and social structure, however perfect

it may be, will not guarantee either itself, or peace, if there is not an active desire to preserve it. Institutions maintain themselves only in so far as there are people willing to sacrifice themselves for them . . . All states must have the courage, after the experiences of the last few years, to be loyal to the police system which they will create. This common will must find expression in a united organization to ensure protection — perhaps today everyone has finally realized that the only basis of peace in Europe is collective security. When we introduced this in 1924 into the Geneva Protocol, the gesture was considered to be unduly adventurous. Great Britain rejected it. Today its significance is self-evident.

. . . After the present war a charter of Human Rights throughout the whole world should be constitutionally established and put into practice.

. . . Our duty now is to destroy the European dictatorships mercilessly, to tear up by the roots everything represented by Nazism and Fascism, to establish in Europe a new era of real democracy and, above all, to be faithful to this new regime and to have the courage to defend it at any price. The evil must be checked at the beginning. For later it may be too late, as it was in the present war.

News Flashes from Czechoslovakia, Release No. 114,
January 5, 1942.

Official Communiqué Issued on the First Anniversary of the Joint Declaration for Polish-Czechoslovak Confederation, London, November 11, 1941

The Polish-Czechoslovak Coordination Committee, composed of the representatives of the two Governments, held a meeting to continue the coordination of the work aiming at the establishment of a Polish-Czechoslovak Confederation after the war.

The meeting reviewed the work accomplished during the twelve months which elapsed since the Declaration of the two Governments of November 11, 1940, envisaging the formation of such a Confederation, was issued. The work consisted in the preliminary examination of the principles of the Confederation of Poland and Czechoslovakia, and of the close current political collaboration, of which the joint declarations of the Polish and Czechoslovak Governments, such as were made during the Inter-Allied Conference on September 24, 1941,¹ were the outward manifestation.

On the basis of the results achieved up till now the Committee decided

¹ See section Poland, p. 464.

to proceed with the detailed elaboration of the principles of the Confederation. In conformity with the agreed opinion of the two Governments, the Polish-Czechoslovak Confederation is to be a nucleus of the political and economic organization of that European region, in the security and development of which both Poland and Czechoslovakia are interested, and therefore, the Confederation is to constitute one of the indispensable elements of the new democratic order in Europe.

I-A.R., 1942, II, 1, p. 8.

Declaration of the Czechoslovak Government concerning Non-recognition of the Transference of Property, London, December 19, 1941

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic declares that it has not recognized, does not and will never recognize any transference or disposal of property, either movable or immovable which, up to September 27, 1938 was the legal property of the Czechoslovak State, of the Czechoslovak Republic, in so far as such transference or disposal has been carried out since that date under pressure of enemy occupation or also under exceptional political circumstances. In this matter the decision does not depend upon whether such transference or disposal is ostensibly voluntary, or upon whether this has taken place or will take place for the benefit of the members of the Czechoslovak State or members of foreign States.

Furthermore, any transference or disposal of private property carried out since September 27, 1938 under the aforementioned circumstances, has not been and will not be recognized.

This declaration likewise particularly concerns any Czechoslovak securities, compulsory or ostensibly voluntary transfer of which has been carried out since September 27, 1938 under the aforementioned circumstances.

All transference or disposal herein referred to is and will be considered invalid and the Government reserves itself the right to direct the manner and more detailed conditions under which the transfers will be made good and legal claims settled.

Furthermore, the Government reserves itself the right to undertake criminal proceedings against all those who have acted against the spirit of this declaration.

Struggle for Freedom, Czechoslovak Sources and Documents No. 2, New York, The Czechoslovak Information Service, 1943, p. 117.

Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, London, January 13, 1942

[For text see section United Nations, p 7]

Joint Declaration of the General Steering Committee of the Central and Eastern European Planning Board (Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia), January 14, 1942

[For text see section United Nations, p 8.]

Eduard Beneš, President: Address at a Luncheon in Honor of King Peter II of Yugoslavia, London, January 19, 1942

. . . The representatives of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia have assembled to confirm the renewal of those bonds of friendship which traditionally linked our two democratic nations together. The experiences of the war confirmed the principle that general peace and security for all European nations against German aggression can only be lastingly assured by the wise realization of collective security and regional security. In the Yugoslav-Greek Pact, I see one of those foundation stones upon which the Balkan states will build up their own and European security. In the same spirit and with the same aim we are working on a Polish-Czechoslovak agreement and we have already come to important conclusions. Both the Yugoslav-Greek and Czechoslovak-Polish pacts form a basis for wider agreement and for complete organization of Central and Southeastern Europe. If this organization, which we sincerely desire and will support in common with you, is successful, its consequences will be far-reaching. In the mutual dependence of all states in this region, the Yugoslav-Czechoslovak friendship forms an indispensable uniting link.

I-A R., 1942, II, p. 36

Polish-Czechoslovak Agreement, London, January 23, 1942

[For text see section Poland, p. 467]

Jan Masaryk, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Speech at Rollins College Seventh Annual Economic Conference, Winter Park, Florida, February 4, 1942

. . . I am not going to burden you with any historical facts about my country. It has a good European tradition, even though it is a small

country Perhaps I can say a word about small countries in general There are a number of small countries in Europe Just as you cannot murder all the Germans, as some very stupid and cynical people say we should, you cannot murder small nations We must make an infinitely better plan than we did the last time to give the small nations the chance to contribute to the future of Europe to the best of their ability. . . .

Coming from a nation which produced Saint Wenceslaus, John Huss, and Comenius and perhaps the first President of my country, I think we should be entrusted with guarding our national soul. .

The fundamental prerogative of freedom must be preserved for all the small nations of Europe, not only for my own, within a well-devised framework Mind you, outside these things which I claim for the small nations, in the other things we will need a bit of supervision . The economic policy in Europe for the last twenty years was disastrous and helped to bring about this war . . .

There is one thing I want to emphasize to you, and that is let us not have peace immediately after this war It would be a great mistake if we stopped shooting today and sat around a green table to determine the peace terms tomorrow We need a period of examination We need a laboratory period during which we can ascertain the facts There will be a considerable amount of cooling-off necessary after this war. . .

We will have to have — and I submit it in all seriousness — a period of preparation before we settle down to a permanent peace, and the peace can be permanent . . .

We are not fighting this war for Czechoslovakia What we are fighting this war for is to keep the eternal light of freedom burning — freedom and religion and Christianity . . .

Speeches of Jan Masaryk in America, The Czechoslovak Information Service, p. 22-5.

Jan Masaryk, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Speech at College of the City of New York, April 16, 1942

. . . When this war is won — and it will be won — the new era of international relations will begin — then again it will be America, whether you like it or not, which will take the lead. There will be need for material help, but what is more important, there will be crucial need of steady and confident moral leadership. The youth of Europe will be

demoralized — the youth of Germany almost lost. The years of physical and mental suffering of untold millions will have left an indelible mark on the next generation. In the totalitarian countries, truth, honest thinking, intellectual honesty and scientific accuracy have disappeared altogether. And to make the peoples in these countries use their brains again independently, instead of depending on one half-educated gangster to do it for them, will be a task for all of us. I would like to see a permanent commission formed for the re-education of derailed Europe, and I am happy to say that certain beginnings in this direction are being contemplated. I consider moral medicines as important as the actual medicines which Europe will need to be healed. I can go on endlessly enumerating what will be needed, but that is not my purpose tonight, I wish to stress here my definite persuasion that only if Europe is reinstated into the realms of human dignity can America preserve all the wonderful things we all are fighting for. Isolation will never again be possible.

A great deal will depend, of course, on the way in which help will be given us after the war. We will be tired and sick and sad, but one way or another we will still be proud, and we shall expect a firm but gentle hand. I hope you do not consider me immodest for this perfectly frank thinking aloud, but if we do not call a spade a spade now, we are apt to lose an opportunity which will never come back. America has a unique opportunity — that is true. To reinforce everything that made her great, to prove to the world that her way of life is infinitely worthwhile and to become a just, not conceited, leader in that transitional period into the new world which is upon us — a great many changes may have to take place even in America. The social results of this struggle are going to be far-reaching. Money and property is daily losing its hitherto undisputed significance. America's material and mechanical development in my lifetime has been so astounding that it sometimes overpowers the moral and intellectual development of the masses. To bring about an equilibrium between the material and the ethical, the seen and the unseen, the known and the hoped for — that, in my estimation, is the most glorious contribution which America should, can, and will bring to those here and over there to whom democracy was and again is going to be the pivot of their concrete and abstract future. So you see, my friends, we do not expect little from America, but why should we — America does not expect little from herself. The order of the day is winning of the war. Winning it by superior armaments and superior soldiers, that lies within your and our power. The order of tomorrow is permanent peace, the abolishing of world wars as a political instrument —

a return to democracy — a return to international law — a return to international justice — a return to decency.

Speeches of Jan Masaryk in America, The Czechoslovak Information Service, p. 52-4; *Vital Speeches*, 1942, VIII, 15, p. 477-8.

Eduard Beneš, President: Speech at the Foreign Press Association, London, April 28, 1942

.

I was asked to take as the subject of my talk today the question of the future of small nations and the idea of federation. The theme is a rather complicated one and difficult to explain clearly in a short speech. But I shall do my best and I apologize for speaking about it in quite general terms. . . . But the maintenance of the independence of these small nations is still and will be again in the future vital to the peace of Europe. In a free Europe there can be no such thing as a client state or a hierarchy of states, as the Nazi New Order would propose, because true nationhood and democracy go together, and the Europe of tomorrow cannot tolerate any *Herrenvolk* rule over non-German peoples.

I think that this view is now again wholeheartedly accepted by all people. We all know very well our weaknesses and mistakes in the past. But what shall we do in order to avoid them in the future? The principle of freedom for these occupied smaller nations is again fully acknowledged. Abyssinia is already liberated. The European democracies are in full alliance with Soviet Russia. The United States has initiated the policy of the Atlantic Charter and are Allies of the occupied small countries. China is taking her part in world politics to which, as a very great power, she is fully entitled. We know that we must reorganize Europe and the world. What will happen with the smaller states?

There is still a skeptical attitude towards them. Disquieting books and articles have been published recently in this country regarding their future status or the need for dividing Europe into spheres of influence, so that, after all, client states are to be dependent upon their powerful neighbors. In some of the arguments in favor of federations and federal unions I detect a certain impatience with, and contempt for, the smaller nations. From time to time I still hear the argument, that after all, the Germans are a great people and have the right to direct in some sense the life of their smaller neighbors, which, according to different voices, have not behaved always reasonably, and so forth.

Politically, this is, I think, a profound mistake. We must not forget that the smaller nation also has an important contribution to make to

the world's culture. Holland, shaking off the tentacles of Spain, was a small, but a great country. Poland and Bohemia had both for many centuries profound cultures which could flourish naturally and properly only when they were free. Spain, when she ceased to be a world empire, was none the less free to develop her own soil. When the Germans a year ago pushed their way through Greece none could forget that more than two thousand years ago the Greeks were numerically a small people who had given to posterity a profound spiritual heritage.

This historical truth still has its value in spite of the technical progress of the twentieth century, and there exist today small nations and states from which such great nations as Germany and Italy could learn with the greatest profit for themselves.

For the final settlement of the status of the small nations federal schemes have been discussed in the course of the last two years, and even international organizations similar in constitutional structure to the Soviet Union or the United States of America have been taken into consideration. But I am certain that at the present time there cannot be a United States of Europe similar to the United States of America. While it is true that air transport, economic necessities and other technical issues have revolutionized our ideas of speed and space, while it is true that Europe must develop more along federal than along national lines, we must think in terms of the realistic conditions and possibilities of our time and in terms of organizations which promote, and do not retard, which conserve, and do not destroy, national culture.

Sometimes I wish that the advocates of federal union would pay less attention to the federal character of the United States, which is itself a single nation, and more attention to the British Commonwealth of Nations. One of the many merits of the British Commonwealth is its refusal to make a fetish of federalism. It is a loose — and, for that very reason, a strong — association of equal partners, each vitally concerned with its own regional problems, but each collaborating willingly within the Commonwealth. The flexibility of the British Commonwealth is something which compels a foreigner's admiration. And the real reason for it is not only British statesmanship and the high political sense and experience of the British people, but above all, other most important factors in politics: geography, national tradition, earlier developments, and so forth. And this is also the reason why I do not propose to imitate blindly and thoroughly this British or any other example in a special European continental case.

Geography sets limits to the natural regions in which the principle of ethnographic frontiers can be applied on the one hand, or in which

neighboring countries can usefully cooperate in a federal or confederated bloc on the other. As I have already observed, political sovereignty was frequently carried to absurd limits after the last war in Central Europe, and this is not less true of economic sovereignty. The idea of confederation is therefore a sound and fruitful idea for the nations in this European area. The mere fact that a confederation has been brought into existence should bring advantages to all its component members. The members of our Government believe, for instance, that our projected confederation with Poland will benefit our Polish neighbors no less than ourselves.

But we want our scheme to be flexible and adapted to the natural conditions of our nations and regions; to geography, national tradition, social and economic structures, earlier developments, and so forth. We accept it as being eventually possible for neighboring states which have methods of government which are democratic and approximate roughly to our own to join the Polish-Czechoslovak Confederation. We regard these political schemes as steps towards a more harmonious unity in Europe; but we also regard them as safeguards of small nationhood.

But I know very well too that this regard for nationhood can be carried to absurd limits. The Axis created a separate state of Croatia which its puppet king dared not visit, and their efforts to destroy Czechoslovak unity by creating a separate state of Slovakia have been pitiable. Between Czech and Slovak regions there are natural and inseparable bonds. But every separate nation can, and should be, trusted to provide regional autonomy or decentralized administration wherever it is justified. The Czechoslovak Republic will surely after this war have its own more decentralized constitution and local administration. Other European nations will in this sense adapt their interior conditions to the new post-war necessities.

For all these reasons the smaller nations in the future Europe will again live, and must live, in their free states. They can and surely will combine in confederated blocs and these blocs will perhaps be later united in larger units under a new European or world organization as we had it in the League of Nations. Democratic regional decentralization in these free states will be necessary and inevitable. But regional decentralization is one thing; the claim of a minority to form a state within a state is another. And again I underline the principle that every well-balanced nation can and must make concessions in language, and culture — but the writ of its own Government must run from one end of the state to the other. Here there can be no compromise, and if a minority problem is likely to be intractable I am prepared for the grim neces-

sity of population-transfers. These population-transfers have been made on several occasions since the end of the last war. They are in general not popular. They can create many hardships and even injustices. But I am bound to say that they may be worthwhile if they help to establish a more permanent equilibrium.

This brings me to my conclusion, and I should like to indicate certain principles which will perhaps be applied in the future peace, when the security of the smaller states will be established and the idea of federation or confederation put into practice in a reorganized post-war Europe.

(1) I admit that the European system of 1919 developed finally into a kind of exaggerated local nationalism, which after the present war should be reasonably limited. But I resolutely refuse to accept another even more dangerous exaggeration, which would simply wipe out the smaller states from the map of Europe. There must be no return to the pre-war habit of placating a strong aggressor with the sacrifice of a small nation, and the danger of such a return is a strong argument for creating confederations capable of holding their own against any aggressor.

These confederations could have the necessary financial, economic and industrial strength to provide themselves with well-prepared and well-armed forces and a sufficiently strong air force, controlled by a new organized system of European security. They could be economically better balanced than the separate small states; and politically they could have a more real sense of security and a greater absence of fear regarding their national existence than was the case under the Versailles settlement.

(2) It is no mere phrase that today we are fighting for the political, cultural and spiritual freedom of smaller nations. But we must take into consideration also that the present war will provoke great social movements and changes in post-war Europe and that great internal upheavals and revolutions will transform the present internal social and political structure of the small nations as well. Their internal structures will be strongly accommodated to one another and in the end it will not interfere in the least with the solution which has been reviewed in my speech. On the contrary, it will help us to take into account the past mistakes of exaggerated political and economic sovereignty, the need for proper political and social security and the imperative necessity of creating in Europe a more permanent equilibrium of political peace and economic collaboration. We must find a way of facilitating and canalizing this development on the European Continent at the moment of the German collapse.

(3) It would be a mistake to try to combine the national states into purely *mechanical units*, to force those states which do not wish to live together to create larger unorganic units which would be again dismembered on the first occasion of an unexpected international conflict. These new units must be organically logical, internationally and geographically sound and adapted to the new post-war political, social and economic conditions.

(4) It would be another mistake to attempt to establish new international units without making the previous necessary arrangements with the great European Allies, Great Britain on the one side, and the Soviet Union on the other, who are both vitally interested in the European Continent.

We should, I think, maintain the present war-community of the United Nations, as the basis of the future peace-organization of the post-war world. This community has the great advantage of having as original members the United States of America and the Soviet Union. With the approaching victory other nations, especially the South American nations, will certainly join us. I consider it to be the duty of this great association of powers to prepare the way for agreement regarding the fundamental issues of the future peace as soon as possible — and certainly during the war. Their plans should be ready as soon as the time comes for negotiating the armistice conditions, which in my opinion will be more important than the later peace negotiations. And we must not, of course, forget that France will remain a great country and that she must again play her part on the Continent after the present war.

(5) Another fundamental condition of the creation of new confederated units is complete political equality, a similar social structure and a really democratic constitution for each of the individual members. It will be necessary to bear this great principle constantly in mind in connection with every federal or confederative combination, especially in Central Europe.

A program which begins with the confederation of two Slavonic states in Central Europe may seem unduly modest to those who advocate a European federation or a world brotherhood even more extensive than the League of Nations. But this modest scheme does not represent our final aim. We regard confederations in Europe as an element in some sort of world commonwealth. Indeed, without this broad framework we cannot contemplate a regional confederation.

The security and peace of Europe are indivisible. Even the confederated units will not assure the independence of the smaller nations if the larger states and the great powers cannot be fitted into the frame-

work of a general European and world system. But above all, we must establish a new international morality and a new respect for international law. In the recent past international agreements were violated not only by systematic aggression, but also by tolerating aggression and by lack of the courage to resist it.

I prefer organic growth from the small to the great, even if it be necessarily slow. This is better than beginning with large European and world units, at which we must arrive by stages and after very cautious preparations. The nations need for this a reasonably long period of peace. To achieve this we must apply Point 8 of the Atlantic Charter, and the United Nations — continuing their present political collaboration after the war — must agree to a provisional system of security and cooperation. It is scarcely necessary to add that Germany must be given no opportunity of rearming and of again destroying her smaller neighbors through the deadly Hitler process of “one by one.” And especially when we establish this new peace, we must have the courage and really strong will to defend it honestly and at all costs.

I-A.R., 1942, II, 6, p. 127-9.

Eduard Beneš, President: Speech to the Liberal Social Council, London, May 12, 1942

The first and most fundamental question which we all ask most frequently is: What are we fighting for and how should we prepare the new peace?

I like to discuss the shape of post-war Europe because I believe that the end of the war, when it comes, will be speedy and, perhaps, sudden. And we must not come too late with our scheme and our post-war plans, because otherwise we shall be thrown into complete chaos by overwhelming events of a revolutionary character.

In the *first place* we are fighting for certain moral values. We are taking part in the war between democracy and dictatorship. We are fighting for the democratic way of life in which the Anglo-Saxons have been pioneers. Such a way of life is fundamentally opposed to the cultural and moral barbarism which the Nazis expressed in their repudiation of freedom for the individual and the citizen, of human dignity and equality, in the domination of weaker peoples and in the violation of treaties and the pledged word. We are fighting, in fact, for some sort of international charter which shall embody the rights of man and be applicable to the people of all countries.

Secondly, we are fighting for a new social and economic order. It has often been said that a war merely accelerates tendencies and natural processes, and there is not the slightest doubt that the consequences of the war, whether we like them or not, will be far-reaching and, perhaps, revolutionary. The war of 1939 is really a continuation of the war of 1914, and some of the problems shelved at the Peace Conference must be faced now. Some of these social and economic problems are on a scale so vast that states must be linked together if there is to be any solution. The democratic process, so widely accepted in the political sphere, must be applied just as wholeheartedly to the social and economic sphere.

For many countries on the European Continent it will mean a real social and economic revolution. In the one it will go very far, in the other it will be simply the continuation of the pre-war social evolution.

... *Thirdly*, we are fighting in the belief that we shall guarantee the future peace, that we shall fashion the right system of collective security and fulfill in the most effective manner the tasks which after the last war we left to the League of Nations

Fourthly, we are fighting for a political reorganization of Europe and the world. this therefore involves post-war Germany, post-war Central Europe, the situation of Italy and of the Balkans, of the Mediterranean, the destiny of France and her Empire, the reorganization of Western and Northern Europe, the new status in the Far East, in Africa and so on. On the whole it is the same as that which President Roosevelt has defined in his so-called "four freedoms "

But, in my opinion, this time we must proceed otherwise than after the last war. First of all I think we should prepare in time, that means certainly before the end of the actual warfare, the conditions of the armistice, which would contain the fundamental features of the peace itself. We cannot in the present war postpone the settlement of many questions, as, for instance, the fundamental territorial questions, disarmament questions, the questions of raw material supplies, perhaps colonial questions, etc., for a vast world peace conference which would be convoked only several months after the armistice and which would last for one or two years, as was the case in 1919. The European world will be after the present war in such chaos and disruption that we must go rapidly in the first two months if we really wish to reconstruct Europe properly and give as soon as possible to the suffering European nations some kind of satisfaction, order and peace. In my opinion, the present combination of 26 United Nations must continue to function. First they must together win the war completely. Then they must make a military occupation of all the territories which are politically and

strategically important and establish the Armistice conditions. Together they must decide, at the same time, the procedure and methods of the European reconstruction, and the time of final settlement of the real ultimate peace conditions with Germany and Hungary, Italy and Japan. In this way the real peace conference should be convoked only later, when some kind of provisional peace and order would be re-established on the basis of the armistice conditions.

The fundamental features of the new reorganization of the European Continent and of the world should be decided in the armistice scheme. The details of this reorganized world should be discussed and finally decided at the peace conference. The provisional scheme of security should be decided in the armistice terms. It could be enforced only by the common will of the victorious United Nations. The United Nations could then proceed to a scheme for the creation of a new sort of League of Nations. It would not be a theoretical construction or a purely juridical instrument embodied in the armistice terms. It would be a practical organization based upon experience acquired in Geneva but advancing by stages and developing a well-tested sway and authority over a longer period of time.

.

Now I put another post-war peace question: What will be the position of the Soviet Union or France in the post-war Europe?

There is, I think, no need to labor the point that Soviet Russia must play her full and rightful part in the post-war settlement. Her isolation from the councils of Europe throughout the greater part of the two decades of so-called peace between the two World Wars was clearly a major tragedy. . . .

. . . The regeneration of France will be achieved in a manner very different from that envisaged by the present regime in France. It will be achieved, I believe, by a young and fully democratic generation, and it will be our task to welcome the arrival of this regenerated France at the council tables of Europe at the earliest possible moment.

.

I come now to another essential question:

The fundamental problem of European peace was in the past and will be again in the future, the position of Germany. . . .

. . . we cannot even begin to decide the status of Central Europe until we have found, and applied, the just solution for the German problem. To my mind it is a primary condition of permanent European peace

that Germany should be restricted to those frontiers which she held before her illegal and tyrannical occupation of Austria, let alone the frontiers which she held before the Munich decree, which no Czechoslovak patriot can bring himself to regard as a proper international agreement, freely negotiated by all the powers concerned and no consequence of which he can recognize as valid. Even these German frontiers should be revised in favor of Germany's neighbors if a liberated Europe judges this to be necessary for her security. I think that it would be a profound mistake if we allowed Germany to retain even an inch of the territory which she acquired through force or the threat of force. Otherwise it would appear as though force and violence had been justified, and even though Hitler and his regime were to belong to the past, the justification of their force and violence would tempt a successor to take the same path to destruction. The Germans of today and tomorrow must be convinced that force does not pay. On the contrary, it involves useless sacrifices and a stern retribution.

. . . No man in his senses would condemn Germany to the fate of Carthage, and this is not the necessary consequence of my theory; but unless we make it clear that aggressive war will always involve punishment of the State and nation which provoked it and that civilized man simply will not accept crude racial theories, anti-semitic and other cruelties, or other Nazi measures and theories regarding the *Herrenvolk*, I see no hope for Europe or humanity. In any case we cannot build anew in Europe until the threat of a new war is over. A long period of quiescence will be necessary, and for that reason I must endorse the unilateral disarmament which the Atlantic Charter has prescribed.

There will be much more discussion as to what should be done with Germany. This time it will certainly be necessary for the Allied troops to march to Berlin. People are also speaking of what is called a re-education of Germany and of the German people. In my opinion no nation can be changed merely through pressure from without. The re-education of any nation merely means a profound internal change, both political, social, economic and moral, and this can be attained only through a profound inner revolution. If after this war we do not succeed in causing Germany to pass through an internal change and revolution of the profoundest nature which will purify the German people from all the filth and evil into which Germany has been dragged not only by Nazism but also by its whole national political education of the last sixty or seventy years since 1870, and even since Frederick the Great, then we shall have a third world war in another twenty years or so.

.

The same is true of Hungary. . . I only stress the following two facts:

1. Never must it be forgotten that as long as we have the present-day Germany and the present-day Hungary, *i. e.* Hungary and Germany with their present political and social structure and education, it is nonsensical to think that we can divide them from one another. This is also true of her position in the present war. Hungary, like Germany, must be re-educated and pass through a similar political and moral revolution.

2. Hungary began this war with the same aim and by the same methods as Germany . . . I ask only one question. can Hungary after the present war be rewarded for all this by being allowed to keep the territory which she has robbed from her neighbors who are today occupied by her and Germany?

I ask this question. I do not answer it because I represent an interested party. I expect the answer from our other Allies.

.

And my last question is: what will Czechoslovakia do in this new Europe? .

All the problems of the peace of which I have spoken here closely affect the future post-war Czechoslovakia. In the struggle for reconstruction in this spirit our State will certainly play an intensive part. These four aims, the struggle for the dignity of man and for the reconstitution of moral human values, the struggle for economic democracy, for a new security in Europe and the world, and for the political reorganization of Europe and the world for which we are fighting today, are fully shared by Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia will certainly be in sincere friendly relations with Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. She will fight with the others for a new Germany and Hungary Europeanized through the new political and moral revolution. She will strive for a new Continent in which France should again have her place, in which the Allied States of Central Europe should attain their place and should see all the injustices made good that have been committed against them, and for new confederative combinations — as for instance the Polish-Czechoslovak confederation — and for a new, better and more radical solution of minority questions. For all this she will strive sincerely and consistently in agreement with the main Allies, Great Britain, Soviet Russia and the United States. Here again we believe optimistically that we shall be successful.

We are also preparing a precisely thought-out plan for our internal reconstruction. We are deciding what we should do immediately after the fall of Germany, how we should organize our party life, how we

should prepare a revision of the constitution and a decentralization of the administration, how we should carry out important social and economic reforms. And we believe that soon after the war we shall again have order and prosperity in our country and that we shall again soon be one of the best democracies of Europe.

One thing we shall not forget — that our government and our government institutions found asylum and hospitality in this great country. Here they found great political aid. Here they could prepare a new and better future for their people in the sorest period of their history. This will be a great bond for the future between our two nations and states. This fact is already laying the foundations for great, sincere and universal contacts between our countries after the war. After all Great Britain, too, will have a vital interest in not isolating herself from the European Continent. She, too, will have to take an intimate part in the new European security system.

And we, representatives of our oppressed nation, who enjoy the hospitality of your magnificent country, will go back to our liberated homelands with feelings of gratitude towards your great people for all the help, all the moral and spiritual support and inspiration, which will be forever one of the best and most encouraging of our remembrances from the most terrible war ever known in world history.

News Flashes from Czechoslovakia,
Release No. 140, July 6, 1942.

***Joint Communiqué of the Czechoslovak and Polish Governments,
London, June 12, 1942***

While attaching greatest importance to the general international organization of all democratic and peace-loving nations from a point of view of both the security and prosperity of Europe, the Governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia consider, however, the confederation of Poland and Czechoslovakia to be a primary and fundamental aim of their foreign policy during and after the war. This, in the opinion of the two Governments, should serve as a basis for regional organization of that part of Europe with which the vital interests of their countries are bound. The two Governments, abiding by their common decisions of November 11, 1940, and January 19, 1942, and being desirous of speeding up preparatory work in this respect, have instructed the Czechoslovak-Polish Coordination Committee to convoke four mixed

commissions: economic, military, social, and cultural. It will be the duty of these commissions to study the principles and methods of economic, military, cultural and social organization of confederation.

I-A.R., 1942, II, 6, p. 118; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 275.

Jan Masaryk, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Speech at New York, June 18, 1942

. . . there could not be, there will not be, any pardon for the ghettos, for the concentration camps and for that sweet village of Lidice. Those who were guilty of those crimes shall be punished according to the law of God and man.¹

Unless the German people experience on their own body the very same treatment being allotted to all of us, they will never again elevate themselves from the beastly level to which they sunk so quickly and so willingly. Your great United States will play the leading part when the orchestra of the New World, a better Europe, will be tuned. Let us by all means think about the future peace, but do not let us under any circumstances make these deliberations interfere with our decisive, deliberate, one-track march toward military victory and annihilation of Nazism.

Speeches of Jan Masaryk in America, The Czechoslovak Information Service, p. 74-5.

Mutual Aid Agreement between the United States and the Provisional Government of Czechoslovakia (under the Provisions of Lend-Lease Act of March 11, 1941), Washington, July 11, 1942

[For text see *D. S. Bul.*, VI, p. 607-9; for text of master agreement see United Nations, p. 10]

Jan Masaryk, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Letter to Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, August 5, 1942

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 5th August, 1942,² and I avail myself of this opportunity to convey to your Excellency, on behalf of the Czechoslovak Government and of myself, as well as in the name of the whole Czechoslovak people who are at present suffering so terribly under the Nazi yoke, the expression of our warmest thanks.

¹ See also President Beneš' article in *Journal of Central and Eastern European Affairs*, April 1941.

² See section United Kingdom, p. 253.

Your Excellency's note emphasizes the fact that the formal act of recognition has guided the policy of His Majesty's Government in regard to Czechoslovakia, but, in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding, His Majesty's Government now desire to declare that, as Germany has deliberately destroyed the arrangements concerning Czechoslovakia reached in 1938, in which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom participated, His Majesty's Government regard themselves as free from any engagements in this respect. At the final settlement of the Czechoslovak frontiers to be reached at the end of the war, they will not be influenced by any changes effected in and since 1938

My Government accept your Excellency's note as a practical solution of the questions and difficulties of vital importance for Czechoslovakia which emerged between our two countries as the consequence of the Munich Agreement, maintaining, of course, our political and juridical position with regard to the Munich Agreement and the events which followed it as expressed in the note of the Czechoslovak Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the 16th December, 1941. We consider your important note of the 5th August, 1942 as a highly significant act of justice towards Czechoslovakia, and we assure you of our real satisfaction and of our profound gratitude to your great country and nation. Between our two countries the Munich Agreement can now be considered as dead.

U. K., Cmd. 6379, Treaty Series No. 3 (1942) Czechoslovakia.

Jan Masaryk, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Speech to the Czechoslovak State Council on the Exchange of Letters with the British Government concerning the Munich Agreement,¹ London, August 31, 1942

. . . For us, indeed, Munich never existed; it was made without us and against us. Today the British Government solemnly confirmed this. This means that nothing exists that was forced upon us; in this there are no exceptions. I know only the intact Republic of 1938 in its integrity. It has not been reduced by a single centimetre and it will be this inviolate Republic in whose name our Nation will speak at the peace negotiations. The historic frontiers of the lands of St Wenceslaus, the Slovak frontiers, the frontiers of sub-Carpathian Russia, that is the territory for which we are responsible to our people at home and to their children. Till the end of the war there can be no exceptions and no discussions. After the war, our people at home will speak in an uncompromising language. . . .

Text from the Czechoslovak Press Bureau.

¹ For narrative and documents, see *D.A.F.R.*, I, p. 277-99.

Msgr. Jan Šrámek, Prime Minister: Letter to General Charles de Gaulle, Leader of Fighting France,¹ London, September 29, 1942

. . . I have the honor to inform you that the Czechoslovak Government undertakes for their part to do everything in their power to ensure that France, with her strength, independence, and the integrity of her home and overseas territories restored, obtains effective guarantees for her military security and her territorial integrity and occupies the place in the world which is hers by virtue of her great past and merits of her people

I-A R., 1942, II, p. 249.

Hubert Ripka, Minister of State: Speech at the British Czechoslovak Friendship Club, London, October 7, 1942

Munich's liquidation represents an important landmark in the international policy of the British Empire and of the French people. The results achieved in Czechoslovak foreign politics have provided us with important political, diplomatic and legal means which should enable us to create the necessary basic conditions for the renovation of a more secure and more powerful Czechoslovak Republic than before Munich. . . .

The Allies consider this problem (German and other minorities) to be a question of internal Czechoslovak policy. This internal Czechoslovak problem of the German minority was misused in 1938 for the old Pan-German ideas which Nazified Germany used toward the destruction of Czechoslovakia and the creation of a European crisis which led to the present war. Henleinism was a shameless fraud under which not only the Czechs and the Slovaks, but also the anti-Nazi Germans had to suffer. The political and legal state of affairs with regard to the German minority can, therefore, not be renewed in post-war Czechoslovakia. The majority of the so-called Sudeten Germans adhered to Henleinism willingly, accepted domination of the crooked cross and actively spread it in the Czech, the Slovak and the sub-Carpathian lands. Thus the majority of those Germans are equally guilty and responsible for all that Nazified Germany has done and is still doing in Czechoslovakia. . . .

The German Nation cannot claim more freedom and self-determination than other nations. The Czechoslovak nation has equal rights to freedom and independence which can only be realized in certain frontier, economic and political conditions. All history up to Munich confirms

¹ In answer to a letter from the French National Committee renouncing the Munich Agreement, see also section Fighting France, p. 574

that the freedom of the Czechoslovak nation depends on the natural frontiers dividing it for centuries from the neighboring Reich. On the principle of the Czechoslovak national claim to freedom and in view of the only possible conditions under which it can freely live, the self-determination of the Czechoslovak nation excludes an unlimited right of so-called Sudeten Germans to self-determination. Such a right given to a fraction of the German nation would destroy the freedom and independence of the entire Czechoslovak nation. This is not only a Czechoslovak problem but the problem of all central European states. The problem of nationalities¹ in a free Czechoslovakia can only be settled by competent factors of the liberated nation after the defeat of Germany and her satellites including Hungary. None of us abroad is entitled to prejudice the nation's decision. That is why we have always refused to decide upon anything concerning future relations between Czechs and Slovaks and have objected to anyone who would make his collaboration in the struggle for liberation bound to certain conditions . . .

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 250.

Eduard Beneš, President: Message to the Czechoslovak State Council at the Inaugural Meeting of the Third Session, London, November 12, 1942

.

The third factor in international political thought which from the very beginning of the war, particularly while the Soviet Union was still not involved, was stressed as the new basis for future peace in post-war Europe, was and is the idea of federation or confederation. . . .

There has so far been no attempt to apply this principle in a concrete form. It would seem that the requisite conditions are not yet ripe, and in particular there remain in Central Europe many unknown factors which make it impossible before the end of the war to proceed to binding and ultimate solutions. It is impossible today to say what will happen to Austria, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria. Excepting Austria, all these States have serious quarrels with Allied States and with one another, and no understanding with them can be reached until these are settled. There remain therefore only Poland and Czechoslovakia on the one hand and Yugoslavia and Greece on the other. Both these groups have attempted to negotiate regarding the application of the confederative principle in their future post-war relations.

.

¹ See Dr. Beneš' article in *Dalhousie Review*, October 1941.

... We know that the application of the confederative principle in Central Europe is not only a matter for the nations affected. It affects also the whole of European politics and particularly certain great powers. In so far as they are our allies in the present war it would not be either possible or friendly for us to agree regarding these important matters amongst ourselves and to present them with some sort of a *fait accompli*. Hence in all these questions the Czechoslovak Government is, as I observed in my speech to the State Council last year, loyally informing all our chief allies who are affected, particularly the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the United States of America, and of the continental States in particular Fighting France and Yugoslavia, of all its discussions and negotiations. In view of the fact that the immediate neighbor of our system of collaboration would be the Soviet Union, it is not only necessary from our side that we should keep them informed, but Czechoslovakia considers it necessary in her own interests to come to agreement with them regarding these questions.

Czechoslovakia, which even until this war was a fundamental adherent of the idea of confederation — my endeavor before this war was to build up gradually a real confederation out of the Little Entente — is therefore now trying to see that in this matter there should be reached complete clarity both between all the great powers who are participating in this war and between the Soviet Union, Poland and ourselves.

In view of the fact that in the public political press the question has been raised of certain similar plans, perhaps already existing, between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, I wish to state objectively that our relations with the Soviet Union are really friendly and loyal, that there is today between us the same relationship of alliance as there was before Munich and that it is our conviction and wish that this should remain so after the war; from no official and responsible party, however, has the question of some sort of confederative link between us and the Soviets been put forward, nor does it arise. And the Soviet Government expressly and consistently emphasizes our complete independence within the pre-Munich frontiers.

.

... in the conditions of the armistice, unlike the first World War, there would be included a number of conditions of the actual peace: particularly there should be solved a number of territorial problems which the peace conference would of course have the right to scrutinize and definitely decide.

.

In practice this means that it will be necessary for the Allied nations to remain sincere and loyal allies even after the fall of Germany, that they should now prepare their common agreements and their common decisions, that they should agree in good time, in the course of the war, regarding their mutual disputes and should prepare all the solutions which must be practically applied directly after the armistice.

.

With this is connected a question — in my own view one of the most important morally and politically — a resolute solution of which is universally demanded by all the Allies: the punishment of war criminals. . . .

.

. . . it is impossible to separate the punishment of domestic criminals from that of international war criminals. The Czechoslovak Government will consistently defend this view and considers an international agreement at least regarding certain general principles involved as appropriate and right in this matter.

.

Our foreign policy — corresponding to two unvarying and invariable pillars of our national existence, i.e., our geographical position in Europe between the East and West and our ten centuries of national tradition — has not been and will not be either Western only or Eastern only, but European, internationally synthetic. It will be a people's policy, a democratic policy based on principles not nationally egoistic, and it will be, as it has always been, true to the death to its friends and allies. I am convinced that — in spite of, and perhaps because of, what happened and what is happening to-day — even after this war events will again confirm in our nation the belief that it is not only moral, honorable and decent to follow such a policy, but that such a long-term policy alone will profit every nation and State.

Remaining true to our view that the present allied front must remain solid even after the war, until an effective European security system has been built up — as has been stated in the Anglo-Soviet Treaty¹ — we want to shape our line of international policy in complete agreement and collaboration with all those States which in respect of the reconstruction and organization of post-war Europe and particularly of Central Europe will have on the one hand the greatest influence and on

¹ See p. 235.

the other genuine and direct interest in the matter. As far as I can judge today, this will mean above all Great Britain and the Soviet Union, the United States, resurrected France, Poland, Yugoslavia and ourselves. With all these we should like to come to an agreement as allies for a long time regarding our further policy in all these questions, without in any way excluding the other Allied States. In this matter we shall, I believe, certainly remain also after the war in alliance with the Soviet Union as we were before the war. On the basis of the Declaration of November 1940 we are sincerely striving for a full agreement with Poland, as we are convinced that our difficulties of the past can be definitely settled and that under the influence of the present war, in which both Poland and our country have suffered so much, the present alliance and collaboration, close and now undoubtedly permanent, will continue between our two nations. The exchange of notes between our Government and that of Fighting France itself shows our conception of the development of France after the war and our policy regarding her. We are convinced that the existence of a strong France on the Continent, in collaboration with Great Britain in the West and with the Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia in the East is essential and that it is necessary that this France should be with us all at the signing of the armistice. The latest events in France and Africa completely confirm this diagnosis of ours.

We wish that conditions should develop in this way in the future. In all this I want only to emphasize the facts that I consider the present war as the decisive historical moment for a definite smashing of the Pan-German "Drang nach Osten" and that the present war has undoubtedly demonstrated that for this there is needed the genuine, friendly and loyal collaboration of Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. Our relation to both is one of alliance and friendship, and we want it always to remain such. We wish that after complete agreement has been reached between Poland and the Soviet Union we may also have a full agreement between the three of us with respect to the liquidation of the imperialistic and bloodthirsty "Drang nach Osten." And if we succeed in this we guarantee the whole future of Poland and Czechoslovakia and help the whole of Europe. If we do not, there will be another catastrophe, brought about by Germany in one form or another. I am here expressing only my deep and real political convictions.

.

. . . I must devote a few words to the German question as it affects ourselves.

I said last year that the same principles apply to our Germans in this war as apply to our other citizens. The German Nazis and the German traitors must and will be placed on the same basis as the Czech and Slovak Nazis, traitors and voluntary collaborators. The loyal German democrats who remained with us and who have been with us during the war, are and will be considered as full and equal citizens of the liberated Republic and as such they must and will be reckoned and dealt with.

It is a simple though horrible fact that the Germans, who in our country have gone over to Nazism and who became traitors even before Munich, and who during the war have participated directly or indirectly in the murdering and plundering by the Gestapo, in the violent terror and in the anti-cultural domination of our people, amount to many hundreds of thousands. I want to be objective to all; I do not want vengeance, I want justice. I have said publicly already on several occasions that justice is more than vengeance — and this, in my view, is the literal truth. Our experience with our Nazi Germans is so bad that if every guilty German receives what is in justice due to him there can be satisfied the most justly and deeply wounded feelings of every Czechoslovak patriot. But this presupposes that also the criminals amongst the Czechs and Slovaks will get what is due to them after the war. I shall defend no criminal whether he be a Czech, a Slovak or a Carpatho-Russian, and therefore I shall defend no guilty German either.

I shall defend, however, in spite of this, the idea of collaboration with our democratic and loyal Germans here in exile, and this for a number of reasons. First of all, because a certain number of our Germans, greater or smaller, will remain in the Republic after the war. All Pan-Germanism and all Nazism must be destroyed amongst them implacably. This war gives us the right to this. And the more individual Germans there are who sincerely collaborate with us in this matter, the better will it be for them, and the better will it be for us. Anybody amongst us who opposes any sort of collaboration with our democratic Germans is causing great difficulties for us even today in respect of the peace negotiations.

Fears regarding some sort of premature understanding about our interior regime with our Germans on the one hand, or again excessive hopes regarding such an understanding on the other are not justified — I say this quite openly, addressing myself to all parties. We cannot make such an agreement because we do not know what the conditions will be in relation to these matters in particular after the conclusion of the war, since the attitude towards all the German minorities in Central

Europe will depend upon the degree of our victory and upon the state of Germany and of the countries affected at the moment when Germany falls, and because it will be determined, at least in part, by certain common principles accepted by all the Allies.

. . . What will finally be done by us in respect of minority questions after the war will be dictated partly by the general conditions at home and the psychology of our people at the moment of liberation, partly by the action of our Germans themselves here in exile and at home, previous to and during the war, and finally by the condition and the power of the Allies at the time when Germany falls.

For all these reasons I cannot and do not want here today to examine any concrete solution of our nationality problem at home after the war. It would be premature. I demand, however, the severe punishment of all direct and indirect criminals and offenders, I demand justice in our future political action, partly in relation to the German democrats who were previously and still are loyal to the Republic, and from us Czechoslovaks who are fighting for democracy I demand a democratic attitude to all these questions. If we are able to carry this through justly, the victory of our State after this war will be far more complete than it was after the last one — it will be both internally and internationally more powerful, solid and safe.

.

Eduard Beneš, *The Way to Victory*, Czechoslovak Documents and Sources. London, Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Information Service 1942, 30 p.

Eduard Beneš, President: Lecture at Manchester University, December 5, 1942

We are fighting for a political reorganization of Europe and the world. If we want this reorganization to secure the proper equilibrium of peace we must proceed this time otherwise than after the last war. First of all I think we should prepare in time, that means certainly before the end of the actual warfare, the conditions of the armistice, which would contain the fundamental features of the peace itself. We cannot in the present war postpone the settlement of many questions, as for instance, fundamental territorial questions, disarmament questions, the questions of raw material supplies, or other questions, for a vast world peace conference which would be convoked only several months after the armistice and which would last for one or two years, as was the case in 1919. The European world will be in such chaos and disruption after the present war that we must proceed rapidly in the first two months if we really

wish to reconstruct Europe properly and give some kind of satisfaction, order and peace as soon as possible to the suffering European nations.

In my opinion too, the present combination of twenty-six United Nations must continue to function. First they must together win the war completely. Then they must make a military occupation of all the enemy territories which are politically and strategically important and establish the armistice conditions. Together they must decide, at the same time, the procedure and methods of the European reconstruction, and the time for finally settling the real ultimate peace conditions with Germany and Hungary, Italy and Japan. In this way the real peace conference should be convoked only later, when some kind of provisional peace and order has been re-established on the basis of the armistice conditions.

.

I cannot at this stage enter into a discussion of the part which the United States of America will play in the post-war Europe. It is a problem of the most crucial importance. The plea that the United Nations should first win the war and then proceed to win the peace implies that the United States will agree to abandon her traditional policy of isolation. . . . None of us who envisage a peaceful Europe can forget the potential or decisive influence of the United States.

I have said that Soviet Russia and France are essential factors in a post-war European and Continental equilibrium. This equilibrium, if it is to be permanent, must be based upon a proper balance of political and economic forces. I am not, of course, pleading for any return to the old "balance of power." It is no longer possible to think merely in terms of the old equilibrium of military forces. We must think of a more intelligent division of Europe into units which themselves represent a satisfactory balance of political, economic and territorial forces. Each unit is to function properly and to make its proper contribution to European solidarity. Many students of history and politics believe that the great number of small States in Central Europe and elsewhere were a temptation both to the larger predatory powers and to the other powers which mistakenly believed that they could be sacrificed for the sake of European peace. It happened in 1938 and as you know the sacrifice was vain. They believe therefore that in future the idea of confederation must be applied in Europe, when the present war is over.

I agree that the outstanding problem of the new post-war Europe will be the status of Central Europe in connection with the final post-war status of Germany. . . .

One of the hardest problems of post-war Europe to solve will be the minority question. The British, French, Russians and Spaniards were able to become colonial people. They could develop and civilize new countries. Before the growth of immigration laws and quota restrictions, they could send their surplus population to other continents. The Germans came late into the colonial field, they planted their colonies in other parts of Europe, especially in Central Europe, where the German minorities have been a thorn in the flesh of other peoples. Naturally they act as agents for the country of their forebears. . . .

I confess that I know no ideal solution for this vexed and yet pressing problem. Every solution presents special difficulties. Here and there local frontier rectifications may remove a particular grievance. We cannot altogether rule out the possibility of certain population transfers as a condition for establishing the equilibrium of a permanent peace.

Transfers are a painful operation. They involve many secondary injustices. The framers of the peace settlement could not give their consent unless the transfers were humanely organized and internationally financed. I do not believe that unless the minority problem and territorial quarrels disappear the small sovereign States will give place to the larger confederated units in Central Europe — they will simply not come to an agreement between themselves because of it. In the last resort the real safety of a minority rests upon the clear enunciation and defense of human, fundamental and democratic rights and not of particular national rights. I should like to have the same solution of State and national questions in Central Europe as this country has in Wales.

The Central European Observer, XIX, No. 26, p. 407-8.

2. POLAND

Poland is a Republic which had a one-party Parliament made up of the National Unity Movement which was established in 1937. Other political groups existed outside of Parliament, but they boycotted the elections of 1938. Poland participated in the partial partition of Czechoslovakia, its demands being yielded to on October 1, 1938. On April 6, 1939, following the occupation of Bohemia, Poland entered into a mutual aid pact with France and Great Britain. On August 25, 1939, Poland signed a treaty of mutual assistance with Great Britain, under the provisions of which the Contracting Parties agreed to support each other in any attempts by any European power "to undermine the independence of one of the Contracting Parties by processes of economic penetration or in any other way," and also agreed that if, in case the parties became engaged in hostilities under the terms of the agreement, that they "will not conclude an armistice of treaty of peace except by mutual agreement." The agreement was to remain in force for a period of five years. (For text see *The British War Blue Book*, Misc. No. 9 (1939), p. 49-52; also Poland No. 1 (1939), Cmd. 6101.)

1939

- Sept 1 Invasion by the German Army.
 " 9 Agreement with France concerning the organization of a military force in France.
 " 16 Soviet troops entered Poland.
 " 18 The Government under President Moscicki and Premier Skladkowski left Polish territory. In accordance with the Constitution, the President designated Wladyslaw Raczekiewicz as his successor if the office should become vacant before peace was restored.
 " 27 Warsaw surrendered
 " 29 German-Soviet treaty established a line of demarcation between the two occupied sections of Poland.
 " 30 President Moscicki resigned and Wladyslaw Raczekiewicz constituted in Paris a "government of unity and national defense" with General Sikorski as Premier. This Government established its temporary capital at Angers, France.
 Oct. 2 The United States Government announced non-recognition of the conquest of Poland and continuation of diplomatic relations with the Polish Government-in-Exile in Paris.
 " 4 The British Government announced continuation of diplomatic relations
 " 7 The Vatican announced continuation of diplomatic relations.
 Nov. 9 President Raczekiewicz dissolved by decree the Polish Parliament elected in 1938 on the ground that it was unrepresentative.
 Dec. 7 Agreement with the United Kingdom for mutual cooperation.
 " 9 President Raczekiewicz established by decree the National Council, whose members, representing all political groups, were appointed by the President to serve in an advisory capacity to the Government.

1940

- Jan. 4 Agreement with France relative to formation of a Polish Army in France.
 Jun. 14 Government moved to Bordeaux, and subsequently to London where it established itself on June 21.
 Jul. 18 Agreement with the United Kingdom affirming their political and military alliance.
 Aug. 5 Agreement with the United Kingdom relative to the organization of Polish Army and air units in England.¹
 Oct. 9 Pledge of mutual support and friendship with the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile.
 Nov. 11 Agreement with Czechoslovak Government on close military and political cooperation during the war and in the peace settlement.

1941

- Apr. 5 Agreement with Canada relative to the organization of a Polish Army in Canada for duty overseas.
 Jul. 30 Agreement with the U.S.S.R. pledging mutual aid and declaring German-Soviet agreements after September 1, 1939 null and void. The Soviet Government recognized the Polish Government in London.
 Aug. 5 Agreement with United Kingdom on military cooperation.
 " 15 Military agreement with U.S.S.R. providing for the formation of a Polish Army in Russia.

¹ See *B I.N.*, 1940, XVII, 6, p. 1040; *The Times*, August 6, 1940.

1941

- Sept. 3 First National Council dissolved.
- " 4 Lend-Lease aid extended to the Polish Government by the United States.
- Nov. 5 Joint Declaration by Poland, Czechoslovakia, Greece and Yugoslavia at the International Labor Organization Conference, New York City (see p. 414).
- Dec. 4 Declaration of friendship and mutual assistance signed by Prime Minister Sikorski and Joseph Stalin (see p. 361).
- " 11 Declaration of war against Japan.

1942

- Jan. 7 Poland, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and Yugoslavia set up the Central and Eastern European Planning Board.
- " 13 Allied Declaration on punishment for war crimes (see p. 7).
- " 14 Joint Declaration of Steering Committee of Central and Eastern European Planning Board (see p. 8).
- " 23 Agreement with Czechoslovakia outlining fundamental principles and procedures for a Confederation (see p. 467).
- Feb. 3 A new National Council set up, composed of 20 members representing the four main parties (National, Peasant, National Labor, and Polish Socialist Parties), 9 members representing individual trends of opinion, and 2 representing the Jewish parties.
- Jul. 1 Mutual aid agreement with the United States (see p. 478).
- Oct. 19 Decree issued by the Government in London regarding punishment of war criminals.
- Nov. 25 General Sikorski arrived for third visit to the United States since outbreak of war.
- Dec. 10 Note presented to the Allied Governments on measures of extermination of the Jewish population in Poland.

Count Edward Raczyński, Ambassador to Great Britain: Broadcast to the British People, London, September 9, 1939

. . . The old friend of Poland, France, and her new ally, Great Britain, knew that by helping Poland they were defending liberty, and they knew that no cause could be more popular among the nations of the world than that of freedom, which Poland symbolizes in her struggle against the Nazi invasion. They also knew that Poland's spirit will not break down under the strain and that she is going to remain faithful to her traditions and her allies whatever happens and however the fortunes of war may vary. . . .

We are all determined to carry the struggle on to the end and until a complete and decisive victory. Poland is still bearing the whole weight of the German force, and she will not rest until the freedom of all the nations of Europe, including her own, is made entirely secure against any danger of invasion or foreign domination.

The Times, September 11, 1939, p. 4.

*Polish Legation at Berne: Communiqué Issued the Day of the Signature of the German-Soviet Treaty Delimiting Their Frontiers in Partitioned Poland, September 29, 1939*¹

[Translation]

In view of the attempts at a unilateral settlement of questions arising out of the state of war in Europe, and specially with regard to the problems of Central and Eastern Europe, it is important to make the following statement:

1. Poland is a party to a coalition which aims at defending the principles of international law and at upholding the independence and territorial integrity of Poland;

On the other hand, Article 7 of the Anglo-Polish Treaty of Alliance of August 25, 1939 stipulates that "should the contracting parties be engaged in hostilities in consequence of the application of the present agreement, they will not conclude any armistice or peace treaty unless by mutual agreement."

This Article is reproduced in full in Article 4 of the Franco-Polish protocol of September 4, 1939 (that is to say after the declaration of war), thus supplementing the Franco-Polish Agreements of 1921 and 1928;

2. The Polish army in France will continue to make sure that Poland retains her character of a belligerent party, just as the participation of the British expeditionary force in military operations in France will have similar effect;

3. Any attempt to settle unilaterally the problems arising out of war operations, made during the war, regardless of the assent of interested parties, has no lasting juridical basis, and it is necessary only to recall in this respect the fate of the treaties imposed by force on certain countries during the war of 1914-1918, such as the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (cancelled by Article 116 of the Treaty of Versailles) or the Treaty of Bucharest (cancelled by Article 259 of the Treaty of Versailles). In the specific cases under consideration it is not treaties that are involved but unilateral statements;

4. The Polish Government will recognize no juridical act taken by the powers occupying Polish territory which goes beyond the mere administrative powers reserved to the occupying authorities. In consequence, it desires to reserve for the future all the rights of the Polish State and to bring this reservation to the notice of all persons entering

¹ See also statement by Mr. Zaleski, Minister for Foreign Affairs to *The Times* in Paris (*The Times*, October 9, 1939, p. 10).

into relations with the said authorities or with commercial concerns or companies under the control of the authorities of occupation;

5. It is in the interest of all holders of Polish public securities not to let themselves be influenced by panic and not to dispose of their securities for an unreasonable price, Poland being firmly determined to respect all her undertakings in this respect.

Le Temps, October 1, 1939

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Broadcast from Paris to the Polish Nation, October 6, 1939¹

[Translation]

I declare that the only aim of the Government of national unity will be the restoration of a great and orderly Poland equally just to all citizens. . . . On behalf of the Government of the Republic and of the nation, I solemnly declare before the whole world that the new partition of the Polish State is an act of violence which we shall never recognize. . . . The Polish Army formed on French soil under my command will take over from the hands of the bleeding nation the struggle for the greatness of our mother country. In fulfillment of the historic past which has fallen to it, it will defend with unending devotion our faith, our honor, our liberty, and our right to independent existence as a State.

Le Temps, October 8, 1939.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Report on Talks with British Government, November 19, 1939

Britain and France agreed that it was essential for Poland to be "a powerful state in the Baltic area so as to maintain a balance in the future between Germany and Russia." Poland's first need would be a greater seaboard than that allowed by the Treaty of Versailles. On the other hand it was taken for granted that General Sikorski and his government intended to reconstitute the Polish State on lines different from those existing under Pilsudski and until the outbreak of war. The Polish Government were certain that democratic principles would be accepted as the foundation of the new state, and for himself Sikorski promised to observe them in external as well as in internal policy by ending the artificially maintained antagonism between Poland and Czechoslovakia, and already discussions were started with President Beneš. In the new Poland there would be no discrimination between Jew and Slav.

New York Times, November 20, 1939.

¹ See also his speech to the Foreign Press Association, London, November 16, 1939 (*B.I.N.*, 1939, XVI, p. 44).

Polish Government: Report of Broadcast to the People of Poland, Paris, December 20, 1939

... they "recognize as fundamental the principle that the source of power in Poland is the Polish people, the creator and restorer of a 1,000-year-old State. The Government are only an instrument of the authority of the nation . . . and their duty is to serve the nation. The system of irresponsible and uncontrolled government by one individual is inadmissible in future."

They recognized as their supreme task efficacious participation in the war, to deliver the country from enemy occupation and to assure to Poland — in addition to direct and ample access to the sea — frontiers which would safeguard her security.

The Germans had owed their progress in their march eastward primarily to their skill in exploiting the internal dissensions of the Slavs. Poland now insisted that the solidarity of the Slav States should be one of the bulwarks of the new political organization of the European Middle East. Poland was to be a democratic State. Her national minorities would be assured justice, free national and cultural development, and due legal protection.

B.I.N., 1939, XVI, p. 50.

Ignace Jan Paderewski, Speaker of the Polish National Council, Declaration at the Inaugural Meeting, London, January 23, 1940

... Respect for democratic principles will be the guiding principle of future Polish regimes. We are not struggling for a feudal or a capitalistic or a socialist or a peasant Poland but a unified great Poland.

In the future we must find a form of government reconciling the democratic equality of the citizens before the law and individual liberty with a strong executive adapted to conditions in Europe after a victorious war.

New York Times, January 24, 1940.

Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, President: Address to the National Council, London, January 23, 1940

... With France and Great Britain we are persuaded that the sacrifices of the war imposed by the barbarity of Germany and Russia, impregnated with the pagan spirit, will be fruitful only provided that a durable peace is attained and safeguarded from menace by Berlin or Moscow. Permanence must be secured for the reconstruction of Poland both materially and spiritually; a peace in which the peoples, organized

in free but disciplined democracies, respecting reciprocal rights of development, will be able to work out individual happiness free from tyranny and governed solely by social good.

The Times, January 24, 1940, p. 5.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Interview after Arrival of Government, London, August 30, 1940

I don't merely visualize the resurrection of Poland. I am convinced, firmly convinced, that that will come. . . . But we must also establish an order which, while not repeating the mistakes of former treaties, ensures a durable peace. . . .

On the positive side, we shall have to create some basis of collaboration in Europe that will make possible the maintenance of a durable peace.

In my view it is not necessary to search for a new form of collaboration. The most perfect example of international cooperation is to be found in the British Commonwealth, with its diverse peoples and its far-flung possessions, united in free understanding. Naturally the principle could not be applied flatly to Europe, but in the British Commonwealth I see the nearest thing to an example. . . .¹

The Poland we should recreate would be fully democratic and, I hope, imbued with a true Christian spirit. Freedom would not merely be a word. There would be full freedom for all political parties, without giving room for anarchy. In the social field there would be far-reaching reforms. Economically and socially we should rebuild from the roots — a task which unhappily has been simplified by the fact that everyone in Poland has now become a pauper. The former possessing classes have had everything taken away from them. It is from that basis that we shall rebuild a worthy and a free Poland.

The Times, August 31, 1940, p. 5.

Joint Declaration by the Polish Government and the Provisional Czechoslovak Government, London, November 11, 1940²

The Polish Government and the Provisional Czechoslovak Government have decided to issue the following declaration:

Imbued with an inflexible faith that the heroic struggle now being waged by Great Britain, together with her Allies, against German

¹ See also General Sikorski's Order of the Day to the Polish Army on September 1, 1940, the first anniversary of the invasion of Poland (*New Europe*, December 1, 1940, p. 24).

² For comment by the British Government see *The Times*, November 12, 1940.

tyranny will end in the final defeat of the forces of evil and destruction; animated by the profound conviction that the future order of the world must be based on the cooperation of all elements which recognize the principle of freedom and justice as constituting the moral foundation of all our common civilization; the two Governments consider it imperative to declare solemnly even now that Poland and Czechoslovakia, closing once and for all the period of past recriminations and disputes and taking into consideration the community of their fundamental interests, are determined on the conclusion of this war to enter, as independent and sovereign States, into a closer political and economic association, which would become the basis of a new order in Central Europe and a guarantee of its stability.

Moreover, both Governments express the hope that in this cooperation, based on respect for the Freedom of Nations, the Principles of Democracy, and the Dignity of Man, they will also be joined by other countries in that part of the European Continent. The two Governments are resolved already now to cooperate closely for the defense of their common interests and for the preparation of the future association of the two countries. . . .

I-A.R., 1941, I, 1, p. 12; *The Times*, November 12, 1940.

Stanislaw Stronski, Minister of Information: Statement on the Polish-Czechoslovak Declaration, November 11, 1940

The two Governments declare that they have decided to enter into close political and economic cooperation as independent and sovereign states, thus making the first step towards the foundation of a broader system of States in Central Europe. Indeed, they have already initiated close collaboration in this respect

The main reasons which have determined this decision are clear.

Before the present war thirteen States existed in the Central European area lying between Germany, Italy, and Russia from the Baltic to the Adriatic and Black Seas. Their methods of cooperation, such as the Little Entente, the Balkan Understanding, the Baltic Understanding, were insufficient to avert the dangers arising from their powerful neighbors. Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland in turn fell victims to the German invasion. Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania suffered from the pressure of Russia. Greece is now being attacked by Italy. Other States in that area are also subject to continuous political pressure. One of the chief results of this war must, therefore, be a strong and solid political and economic edifice in this part of Europe. What we are doing

today is the initial period of action and the first step to establish a political and economic system of States in this part of Europe. We are confident that this harbinger of a new European order will be well received by all those in the world who realize that it is not the Germans who are destined to introduce the so-called "new order" in Europe, but that it is the task of those Nations who themselves inhabit this part of Europe.

Text from Polish Information Center, New York.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Address Delivered at Foyle's Literary Luncheon, London, November 14, 1940

In Poland of the future, all that it has to offer will be available to every man and woman who live within her frontiers, irrespective of race and creed

The peace which will conclude this war must not be a peace of vengeance, it must be an act of justice, which will exclude armed conflicts between nations for many generations. We Poles are fighting this war not only to get back our homes and country. We have wider aspirations, we have already given definite proofs of this by a comprehensive understanding with Czechoslovakia ¹ and thus begin a real federation of the European powers. This union of Poland and Czechoslovakia, based upon a close cooperation with Great Britain, should and will, I believe, introduce a new era in Europe of justice, democracy and cooperation between all nations, whatever may have been their relations to each other in the past!

Release from the Polish Information Center, New York;
The Times, November 15, 1940, p. 2.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Interview with the Daily Herald, London, January 29, 1941

Our victory will not come merely by the military defeat of Germany. Peace will not begin when the war ends. Peace can only come, in the real sense of the word, when we have created a new Europe.

The weakness of the Treaty of Versailles was that although it had overthrown a number of sovereigns, it had set up a great many more sovereign States.

It had increased the problems of nationalism by increasing the number of artificial barriers between States. It had destroyed the original economic structure of Europe, without creating a new economic structure to make life possible within its new political frontiers.

¹ See p. 452.

After this war, Europe must become an entity, political and economic. There must be economic security as well as political security for all. We must build from the ground upwards, by securing the well-being, the comfort and happiness of the people.

In the past we have all been too jealous of our private interests, our interests as individuals, our interests as States. We have all got to give something, and the example must be given by the men at the top.

The State, for example, must begin by relinquishing some of its sovereign rights, if this is necessary in order to reach agreement with a neighboring State on matters of common interest, especially when the basic problem of security and defense is concerned.

By an agreement recently concluded between us, we have pledged our mutual collaboration, now and in the future, in all matters affecting the welfare of our two nations. An agreement on these matters is being discussed in detail. I am convinced that in a short time positive results will be achieved which will herald a new Europe, based on law and justice.

Daily Herald (London), January 29, 1941.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Speech on Adoption of the Resolution, June 12, 1941

I rise to associate myself fully, in the name of the Polish nation and Government, with the solemn proclamation which the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, has put before us with such force and conviction. This proclamation addressed to the oppressed nations is resolutely directed towards the goal to which we are advancing in a struggle imposed upon us nearly two years ago, into which we entered with Great Britain, to whom we are bound by a Treaty of Mutual Assistance.¹ Mr. Churchill was speaking not only as the Prime Minister of Great Britain, but as the leader of all the Allies. This goal is Europe rebuilt on the democratic principles of liberty and justice. Our aim was set out in the splendid and eloquent words spoken by the British Prime Minister. It is for such a Europe that Poland was the first country to take up arms against the shameful German aggression with which the U.S.S.R. was so soon to associate herself, and which was followed later upon other fronts by Italian aggression. The Polish Government, supported by every Pole throughout the world, has since remained firmly resolved to hold out until final victory, whatever sacrifice of blood this may involve. For we have to fight in the name of liberty against tyranny.

¹ U. K , Cmd. 6144, Treaty Series No 58 (1939).

On this occasion, when we are united today, I wish to render homage to the courage and tenacity of the British people, to its splendid energy and cohesion, and to its firm will to victory. Having suffered a great deal ourselves in our capital and in so many other Polish towns from the brutal German bombardment, we can fully appreciate the spirit of sacrifice and the marvellous discipline of the British nation. I must also take this opportunity to express the great admiration which we Poles feel for Mr. Winston Churchill, who incarnates British courage, determination and loyalty. His strong and inspiring words which we have just heard will go straight to the heart of the Polish people.

The so-called New Order which Germany is seeking to impose upon Europe by force can only be a form of serfdom methodically organized as it has been described to us today with striking realism. Democracy owes it to herself to oppose this by every means; otherwise the world would enter upon a long period of oppression by the barbarian Teutons. Any suggestion of collaboration with the Reich would prove fatal. France will realize this from experience, like any other country, if the French allow themselves to be persuaded to carry out such a policy.

In contrast to Hitler's deceiving promise of a New Order, Mr. Eden described in his speech of the 29th May the decision of Great Britain to create a state of affairs after the war which would not be aimed at securing unilateral advantages for certain States. The Prime Minister has just referred to this conception in his speech today while proclaiming his faith in the final victory of our just cause, a faith which we share completely and absolutely.

President Roosevelt recently drew a picture of the new world. His guiding thought was that of guaranteeing to individuals and to nations the four principal liberties in a formula which I should like to call a new "declaration for humanity and the nations." These conceptions enrich and strengthen internally the fighting democracies. The latter, in contrast to the totalitarian powers, already have before them splendid patterns of international order founded upon free cooperation.

Such patterns are the great family of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America. As regards my own country, I should like to recall that over five centuries ago Poland created a union with Lithuania and Ruthenia, and as early as November 1939 she endeavored to press forward the program of a federation between the States of Central and Eastern Europe. Victory should not take us unawares, and thus compel the Allies to produce an improvised peace. Victory will mean hard work. We are all now paying too high a price for the mistakes made in the past. We are going through this experience

in the second war brought about by Germany during the lifetime of one generation. It is therefore our duty to bring about a peace which will liberate humanity from the menace of war and prevent any future disloyal rivalries between nations.

Public opinion in the powerful North American Republic now united to us by such close ties of friendship expects of us today a united effort. The personal contacts which I have recently had with President Roosevelt and the leaders of the great American democracy confirm me in this conviction. The U. S. A. cannot take our place in regard to the security of the Europe of tomorrow, but they will not cease to take a very close interest in it.

This inter-Allied meeting today corresponds to this need. It should represent the beginning of an organization designed to consider the New Order in a Free Europe assured of the certain support of the Allied nations and democratic opinion throughout the world.

Such an organization would have a capital importance in reinforcing during the course of the war our moral predominance. It would certainly contribute to shortening the war, which would be in the interests of the countries under temporary occupation and of the great democracies themselves. For the longer the war continues, the greater and more difficult will be the problems we shall have to face connected with the reconstruction of international order.

In this spirit, I associate myself completely with Mr. Churchill. His initiative makes it possible for us not only to express our unity of view in the struggle against evil which threatens the whole of humanity, but also to state that after our victory we will be able to guarantee, by common agreement, a happier future for the peoples we represent. As you have so justly said, Mr. Prime Minister, we represent today a community in arms, and tomorrow we shall be a community to construct a just and stable peace.

U. K., Cmd. 6285, Misc. No. I (1941), p. 5-7;
I-A.R., I, 5, p. 4-5.

Jan Ciechanowski, Ambassador to the United States: Address before the Institute of Public Affairs of the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, June 26, 1941

As security is essential to peace, so prosperity is essential to its duration.

In re-establishing peace after this war on the basis of the conception of the four human freedoms defined by President Roosevelt, the aim to

achieve freedom from want and prosperity should be pursued by all the means at our disposal.

This aim will demand the adaption of modernized economic doctrines to the requirements of a new post-war world. It will have to take into account the necessity of making the resources of raw materials available to all nations, while establishing efficient safeguards to guarantee that they will not be used for purposes inimical to peace. It will also mean such a grouping of states, probably on federative principles, that they would constitute an international organization of states collaborating on the basis of close cooperation. The economic foundations of such an international organization would include the adoption of a low tariff system moving gradually in the direction of free trade.

New Europe, August 1941, p. 220.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Speech at a Luncheon at the Dorchester Hotel, London, July 4, 1941

. . . During the last ten days or so Russia has entered the ranks of Germany's adversaries though up till then she was allied with her. This in itself is a significant and favorable event, whatever might be said of the wrongs which the Soviet Government had previously done to the cause of freedom and democracy, when she seemed not to know which was the proper path for her to take. That path was determined by the principal aggressor: Nazi Germany.

Now that the Soviet Union stands on the side of the nations opposed to methods of aggression and of treating international obligations as scraps of paper, we Poles are entitled to expect that the Russians will not be tardy in restoring Russian-Polish relations to the legal positions based upon mutual obligations undertaken during the years 1921, 1932 and 1935 by means of treaties freely concluded and subsequently violated by the Soviet Union. The restoration of the territories seized by Russia under the pretense of strategic exigencies will now be only natural and justified. The Polish prisoners of war and the thousands of Poles deported from their homes to the depths of Asia, all Poles in prisons, concentration camps or compulsory labor camps should regain their liberty.

.

The principles of peace and work, the principles of political and social security are the foundations of the new structure in which we desire to build in future the undisputed liberty of nations and the freedom of the individual will hold sway. This is the conception developed by the

Anglo-Saxon and all the Christian world. It envisages the international order as voluntary collaboration and government as a duty, as a trusteeship imposing the obligation of protection, guidance and assistance in the development of the creative forces inherent in each nation.

That is why the New Order of the world should evolve from the spirit and the ideas of the British Commonwealth and from the ideals of the great American democracy, and not from the totalitarian states.

After victory is achieved the decision with regard to the future destiny of the European continent will rest in the hands of those democracies.

In organizing that destiny it will be necessary to remember that both the German wars have proved conclusively that it is unnecessary and inadvisable to define in advance how far the security frontiers of the Western democracies extend. In the past they were not situated on the Rhine, but in 1914 on the Sava and in 1939 on the Vistula. This proves the undeniable fact that powers with world-wide interests, cannot without running dangerous risks, define too rigidly the limits of their own security. The organization of international security must be dealt with from a practical point of view. We cannot solve it by means of a political formula, but we must organize an executive with sufficient power to safeguard a lasting peace.

The second aim of the New Order should be an economic organization which would apply on an international scale the principle of planned economy which today is accepted in practice by the majority of States. For only in this way will it be possible to organize the international exchange of raw materials and other products rationally and in the general interests, and to direct investments into the most expedient channels. On the other hand, by raising the standard of demands of hitherto backward States we shall solve the problem of unemployment, which has been a chronic and running social sore in Western countries for the past twenty years.

Here it is necessary to direct special attention to the market provided by the hundred millions and more inhabitants of Central, Eastern and Balkan Europe. They should become a great market for absorbing the manufactures of the highly industrialized countries, on the condition that international economic organization allows them their own consistent development in this sphere.

For their part on the day of victory the continental nations will conduce actively to the building of the New Order on the ruins which the Nazi caricature "New Order" has thrust upon them. The Continental States will unite in federative alliances, capable of surviving economic and political crises. The joint declarations of the Polish and

Czechoslovak Governments, dated November 11, 1940, was the first important step in this direction.

Poland has always rejected the articles of faith which Nazi Germany and Bolshevik Russia have attempted to impose upon her. Our feelings about Communism and Nazism are the same as those of Great Britain, as Mr. Churchill justly formulated them in his speech on June 22nd last. The Poles are fighting for national independence, for freedom of conscience, for equality and democracy based on political security.

Our New Order must be capable of such a life and capable of defense. . . .

Text from the Polish Information Center, New York.

Soviet-Polish Agreement, London, July 30, 1941

[For text see section Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, p. 354 ¹]

Stanislaw Stronski, Minister of Information and Documentation: Speech at London, August 7, 1941

Poland's Eastern frontiers, established by free agreement between Poland and Soviet Russia in the Treaty of Riga in 1921, were recognized by the powers in the well-known decision of the Conference of Ambassadors on March 15, 1923,² and in a special note by the Department of State of the United States of April 5, 1923. This legal status was violated by the German-Soviet agreement of September 29, 1939, for the partition of Poland.³ By the Polish-Soviet agreement of July 30, 1941,⁴ Soviet Russia recognized the nullity of the German-Soviet agreement of 1939. On July 30, 1941, the British Government made a formal declaration that they recognize no territorial changes effected in Poland after August 1939.⁵ At a press conference in Washington, on July 31, Mr. Sumner Welles made an identical statement on behalf of the Government in the United States.⁶ In addition the pact of mutual assistance against aggression, concluded between Poland and Great Britain on August 25, 1939,⁷ is still in force and this pact constitutes the basis of existing Polish-British cooperation in the war. Also since July 30, 1941, Poland and

¹ See also letter from the Polish Ambassador to the United States, Jan Ciechanowski, to the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, September 29, 1941 (*D. S. Bul.*, V, p. 245); General Sikorski's broadcast to Poland on July 31, 1941 (*B.I.N.*, 1941, XVIII, p. 1054-5); and Jan Stanczyk, Polish Minister of Labor and Leader of Polish Labor Movement (*The Polish Review*, 1941, I, 10, p. 1, 2 and 4).

² League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, XV, p. 260 ff. ³ *B.I.N.*, 1939, XVI, p. 1041.

⁴ See p. 354.

⁵ See *Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 373, 1502-3.

⁶ *N.Y.T.*, August 1, 1941, p. 3

⁷ See p. 446.

Soviet Russia have had an agreement of mutual assistance against Germany.¹

So far as special and separate agreements for the guarantee of frontiers are concerned, Great Britain has not entered into any such agreement with any country.

That is how the matter stands in regard to questions of frontier recognition, mutual assistance pacts and frontier guarantees arising out of the Polish-Soviet agreement of July 30

Release from Polish Information Center, New York.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London: Speech by Edward Raczynski, Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs: Speech on Adoption of the First Resolution (Atlantic Charter),² September 24, 1941

The Polish Government welcomed with deep satisfaction the fact of the close solidarity of the two great democracies which made it possible for the President of the United States and the British Prime Minister to proclaim publicly a joint British American program of war and peace aims. The symbolic significance of this manifestation of solidarity stands out not less than the political importance of its clauses. The Polish Government hails the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration in the same spirit of solidarity which ought to unite all nations struggling for the freedom of the world. The Polish nation, just as other nations of the European Continent, will regard this declaration, together with British-American solidarity symbolized therein, as a guarantee of Allied victory and of the freeing of Europe from the German yoke.

The Polish Government, moreover, is profoundly convinced that the principles of this declaration will be applied in future in the spirit of justice, and that the actions of individual nations will not be forgotten by Great Britain or her Allies when the day of reckoning comes, as was suggested by Mr. Eden in his speech in the House of Commons on August 6.³ The Polish nation, which consistently rejected and rejects all German suggestions of collaboration with the Nazi regime, and which was the first nation to oppose the mighty military power of Germany at a tremendous cost in masses of victims, in the cultural achievements of many generations and in material wealth, which resulted in an enormous set-back in the development of the country, as compared with other continental nations, has the undoubted right to expect a just retribution for the wrong inflicted on it.

¹ D.A.F.R., IV, p 260.

² For text of resolution see p. 3.

³ *Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 373, 2042.

The Polish Government is confident that none of the illegal acts perpetrated by Germany on the territory of Poland shall be recognized by the victorious democracies, which will finally convince the German nation that aggression does not pay. In particular, the Polish population of the Western provinces, so ruthlessly transplanted, must be given a possibility of an immediate reintegration in the land of their ancestors and the German settlers, installed in Polish homesteads, sent back to the Reich.

The Polish Government have a profound faith in the sense of justice of Great Britain as well as of the United States and are therefore persuaded that Poland — the first country to stand up to the German onslaught, staking in this struggle her territorial integrity — cannot emerge from this war with a territory reduced in strength and importance. The future frontiers of Poland should safeguard the country's security as a part of the general security of Europe; they should assure Poland's vital need of a wide access to the sea adequately protected from foreign interference, as well as her economic development in proportion to the number of her population. Poland's "Free Access to the Sea," stipulated in Point 13 of President Wilson's 14 Points as a guarantee of our country's independence, should this time be made really free and secure.

The Roosevelt-Churchill declaration, as it is understood by the Polish Government, places security against another war and the achievement of economic prosperity in the forefront as the principal aims of a new democratic order. These aims are also those of Poland. The British Prime Minister gave us in his eloquent broadcast speech on August 24,¹ the assurance that Great Britain and the United States do not wish to repeat the mistake of 1918 by believing that this war was certain to be the last. It follows that prevention against aggression and the outbreak of a third world war will remain as a major problem of the post-war period. The remedial measures against a new war should be varied as were also the causes of the outbreak of the two wars. Point 8 of the Joint Declaration concerning the disarmament of nations guilty of aggression represents an important guarantee. It can, however, hardly remain as the sole guarantee. Experience of the last twenty years is there to prove it. It will be necessary to find other effective additional guarantees.

Both the solution of the problem of European security as well as the task of assuring prosperity of Europe is unthinkable without a close collaboration of the continent with the British Empire and the United

¹ See p. 209.

States of America. The continental nations will assuredly see in the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration a new proof that the two democracies are determined to maintain their interest in the Continent after victory over Germany has been achieved.

In the spirit of the observations set out above I accept the resolution proposed by the British Government

U. K., Cmd 6315, Misc No. 3 (1941), p. 14-15;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 6.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Henryk Strasburger, Minister of Finance: Speech Accepting the Second Resolution, (Post-war Economic Needs of Europe) September 24, 1941

We are today inaugurating a work of great importance. Our task is to restore to life a whole continent and to try to return to prosperity, of which it has been deprived by the will of a single nation. We are creating for this purpose an organization of the people who are now fighting together against a common enemy. The people who are together in this struggle must help each other when war is over. It is not a question of philanthropy. The organization which we are creating today is based on common needs and common aims; all its members wish not only to receive but also to give all they can spare to others. We must pool our production and consumption capacities, our means of transport and credit possibilities, we must restore to countries who have been cut off from their natural markets facilities for disposing of their products. Can Europe and indeed the whole world be saved otherwise from economic and social disaster? In other words, we must oppose the German new order, based on destruction, with other plans, based on mutual help and reconstruction.

The success of our task is assured by the fact that we are led by Great Britain, who undertook to defend human rights and Christian ideals, and that we have on our side the good will and practical support of the great American democracy with all her powerful resources. A great responsibility rests on us. The present war will undoubtedly lead to many changes, both in the economic and social spheres. Our organization will have to face these problems also and will no doubt have a great influence on the creation of new forms of international existence.

The Polish Government are not afraid of their responsibilities in the future world, and that is why I think that this is the right place and the right moment to stress the importance to future stability and peace of the bloc of countries situated between the Baltic, the Black, and the Aegean Seas. These countries are all more or less connected with one

another in various ways. Events have proved that left to themselves they were not strong enough to withstand aggression. In an organized Europe they will become a mainstay of peace, having no imperialistic aspirations either in the economic or political sphere. Indeed, it will be in the interests of Europe that this bloc should be strong, independent, and economically healthy. We believe that cooperation between these nations will improve their economic position. The German wall, separating them from the West, and especially German propaganda, often prevented Western Europe from giving consideration to the necessities of these countries. The mutual knowledge and understanding which has developed out of the ties which now bind us, will bring the countries of Central and Eastern Europe closer than ever before to Western Europe. I have no doubt that a greater interest will be taken in them and close, mutual cooperation will develop.

I accept in the name of the Polish Government the resolution proposed to us by the British Government. The Polish Government will participate wholeheartedly in the organization of supplies for Europe. The fact that we are starting such an important task will increase among the nations, who under the German yoke are waging an underground fight for liberation, their confidence for the future and will strengthen their belief in ultimate victory.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 28;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 10.

Joint Polish-Czechoslovak Declaration, St. James's Palace, London, September 24, 1941

The Polish and the Czechoslovak Governments animated by the spirit of solidarity which inspired their joint declaration of November 11, 1940,¹ on the necessity of establishing after the war a confederation between the two countries, makes the following joint declaration before the Conference of the Allies:

The Governments of the Republic of Poland and of the Republic of Czechoslovakia declare that they are determined to assist in the spirit of close and friendly collaboration in the realization of the principal aims of the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration, namely, the security against a third war and the economic prosperity of the world. Moreover, remembering the experience of the Polish and Czechoslovak nations, which have suffered so much from the insatiable aggressiveness of Germany, both Governments are of the opinion that safeguards against a third

¹ See p. 452.

German war must be sought not only in the complete preventive destruction of the means which Germany might use in the future in another attempt at the realization of her aggressive plans, but also in furnishing effective political and material guarantees and in offering the necessary economic assistance for the reconstruction of the despoiled economies of these nations, which were and may again become, the object of the initial aggressive acts on the part of Germany.

The two Governments are convinced that the carrying out of the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration in the spirit of justice, which does not admit the uniformity of treatment of those guilty of provoking world-wars and of the victims of these wars, will lay the foundations of a new order in Europe, based upon a permanent system of general security, on general prosperity and on social justice. The achievement of this aim will convince the nations of the Continent that their sufferings during the World War of 1914-1918 and during the present war were neither unavailing nor fruitless.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 16-17.

Joint Declaration of Delegates of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia, at the International Labor Conference, New York, November 5, 1941

[For text see section Czechoslovakia, p. 414.]

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Interview to The Czechoslovak on the Anniversary of the Polish-Czechoslovak Declaration, November 11, 1941

The peace for which we long must be based upon respect for the rights of each individual within the framework of the rights of the nation. It must further be based upon reparation for all the crimes committed and upon active safeguards against further violence. The experiences of Poland and Czechoslovakia emphasize in the first place the need for a regulation of their joint western frontier so as to render a new attack impossible and create conditions within their countries which will protect them against fresh enemy measures, including both subversive fifth column activity and the danger from entrenched German strongholds. We must avoid the mistakes and illusions of twenty years ago. Today our nations are paying with their blood for the mistakes of past years.

The association of Poland and Czechoslovakia must strive for the resettlement of affairs in Central Europe and simultaneously for the

creation of a centre which shall radiate the common ideals for which our two nations are fighting and suffering.

The cooperation with Great Britain begun in London will be continued permanently. The development of transport has shortened distances and made the world a smaller place, bringing Great Britain closer to the continent and linking her fate still more closely with that of the continent. Nowhere will England find surer and stauncher allies than Poland and Czechoslovakia. I firmly believe in this cooperation which under these conditions must become still more close. And since we have something to do with the great sea powers, the Baltic ports will become the natural instruments of this cooperation!

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 8-9.

***Declaration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Polish Republic on Friendship and Mutual Assistance, Moscow, December 4, 1941*¹**

[For text see section Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, p. 361.]

***Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Address over the Soviet Radio from Moscow after Signature of Polish-Soviet Declaration, December 4, 1941*¹**

. . . The War now in progress is not only a war for the territories and borders of the states taking part in it. This most terrible conflict in history is at once a universal revolution and a life and death struggle between two mutually exclusive concepts of human life. A new and just world will emerge victorious from this struggle, a world of free peoples placing freedom above all else, a world based on the inviolable foundation of honest democracy. . . .

Both sides are ready to forget everything that separated them in the past. We trust that the Soviet peoples will not forget that in the hour of their gravest trials we stood up beside them and that they realize what significance a strong and friendly Poland confronting Germany has for them.

Mutual good faith and mutual respect for each other's national independence and sovereignty — these are the only conditions that make such relations between us possible. Realizing their necessity and usefulness, we shall in the future work also for complete implementation of

¹ See also Prime Minister Sikorski's press interview on his return from Russia, London, January 9, 1942 (*The Times*, January 10, 1942, p. 3; *New York Times*, January 10, 1942).

the agreements concluded in July ¹ and August ² of this year. Thus we shall set for the whole world an example of the way in which the most difficult and disputable problems should be decided, in conformity with the interests of both states and on behalf of the common aims of mankind . . .

There can be no agreement, no compromise with the Germany of today. Future generations will have to realize that one cannot commit crimes with impunity. The laws of a barbaric ideology must be destroyed with fire and sword. . .

This war has taught us Poles many things, and therefore we are united and fighting in concert for a new Poland — a Poland whose strength will be founded on the equality of all its citizens before the law, without distinction of race or creed, on political, social and economic democracy.

And while organizing Europe after victory, we must ban from it all particularism, the worst scourge of our time. This particularism was cunningly exploited by Hitler to set all peoples at loggerheads and to enable him to enslave other peoples. A new world will be founded not on the legal formulas of doctrinaires, but on honest international solidarity and a national federation of peoples.

Embassy U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, No. 123, p. 3, 6-8.

Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, January 13, 1942

[For text see United Nations, p. 7.]

Joint Declaration of the General Steering Committee of the Central and Eastern European Planning Board (Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia), January 14, 1942

[For text see section United Nations, p. 8.]

Agreement for a Polish-Czechoslovak Confederation, London, January 23, 1942

In execution of the declaration of the Governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia of November 11, 1940, whereby both Governments decided that after the war Poland and Czechoslovakia shall form a Confederation of States in that area of Europe with which the vital interests of the two countries are bound, the Governments of Poland

¹ See p. 354.

² Polish-Soviet Military Agreement providing for the formation of a Polish army in the Soviet Union.

and Czechoslovakia conducted uninterrupted negotiations on the subject of the method of bringing the above declaration to fruition. At the same time both Governments adopted a resolution expressing their satisfaction with the conclusion of the Greek-Yugoslav agreement of January 15, and their conviction that the security and prosperity of the area of Europe situated between the Baltic and Aegean Seas depend primarily on the collaboration of two confederations, the foundation of one of which has been laid by the Polish-Czechoslovak agreement and of the other by the Greek-Yugoslav agreement. Both Governments reached agreement with regard to a number of principles of the projected Confederation which were defined in the following declaration:

The Governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia have agreed on the following points with regard to the future Confederation of Poland and Czechoslovakia

1. The two Governments desire that the Polish-Czechoslovak Confederation should embrace other states of the European area with which the vital interests of Poland and Czechoslovakia are linked up.

- 2 The purpose of the Confederation is to assure common policy with regard to foreign affairs, defense, economic and financial matters, social questions, transport, posts and telegraphs.

3. The Confederation will have a common general staff, whose task it will be to prepare the means of defense, while in the event of war a unified supreme command will be appointed.

4. The Confederation will coordinate the policy of foreign trade and custom tariffs of the states forming the Confederation with a view to the conclusion of a customs union.

5. The Confederation will have an agreed monetary policy. Autonomous banks of issue of the states forming the Confederation will be maintained. It will be their task to assure that the parity established between the various national currencies shall be permanently maintained.

6. The Confederation will coordinate the financial policies of the states forming the Confederation, especially with regard to taxation.

7. The development and administration of railway, road, water and air transport as also the telecommunication services will be carried out according to a common plan. An identical tariff for postal and telecommunication services will be binding on all the territories of the Confederation. The states in possession of sea and inland harbors will take into consideration the economic interests of the Confederation as a whole. Moreover, the states forming the Confederation will mutually support the interests of the sea and inland harbors of the states forming the Confederation.

8. Coordination will also be applied in the realm of social policy of the various states of the Confederation.

9. The Confederation will assure cooperation among its members in educational and cultural matters.

10. Questions of nationality will remain within the competence of the individual states forming the Confederation. The passenger traffic between the various states included in the Confederation will take place without any restrictions, in particular without passports and visas. The question of free domicile and of right to exercise any gainful occupation of the citizens of the individual states forming the Confederation, over the whole territory of the Confederation will be regulated.

11. The question of the mutual recognition by the states forming the Confederation of school and professional diplomas of documents and sentences of court, as well as the question of mutual legal aid in particular in the execution of court sentences will be regulated.

12. The constitutions of the individual states included in the Confederation will guarantee to the citizens of these states the following rights: freedom of conscience, personal freedom, freedom of learning, freedom of the spoken and written word, freedom of organization and association, equality of all citizens before the law, free admission of all citizens to the performance of all state functions, the independence of the courts of law, and the control of government by the representative national bodies by means of free elections.

13. Both Governments have agreed that in order to ensure the common policy with regard to the above mentioned spheres, the establishment of common organs of the Confederation will be necessary.

14. The states included in the Confederations will jointly defray the costs of its maintenance.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 26-7; *New Europe*, February 1942;
D.A.F.R., IV, p. 273.

Wladyslaw Raczkiwicz, President: Address to National Council, London, February 24, 1942

. . . The Polish nation will not hesitate one moment if she has to bear sacrifices in the name of ideals of progress, social order and justice. In closest collaboration with Poland's allies on the free soil of Britain we share in alliance of nations as representatives of the unbrokenly enduring Polish state and the Polish nation. We are mandatories of homeland and its standpoint, its will and desires are decisive for us. Homeland which remains in temporary fetters of German domination expects of us deeds according with its desires and in harmony with its

honor We know that in the forefront of these desires is the will to maintain the integrity of our state supplemented in accordance with the needs of strategy, security and national economy. In this desire we are all unanimous and agreed.

. . . The National Council represents the broadest possible basic trends of the Polish political thought It is my wish that the idea of national unity shall be a continual inspiration of your labors and that you shall act in accordance with this postulate. I would also desire to see labors of the National Council actively supported by all Polish emigrants of the past with the American Polonia at their head. Among the members of the National Council we also have representatives of Poland's minorities. I hope that this representation will be enlarged to embrace other nationalities which for more than 500 years have been associated with our state through good times and bad. This fact reveals that modern Poland is worthily continuing the tradition of the Polish commonwealth of nations, linking a number of nationalities together in the name of freedom and brotherhood. It is my hearty desire that for the good of Poland which endures uninterruptedly and which continues to fulfill her historic role in consequence of great world-wide conflicts, you should carry out your labors — in harmony with the Polish nation, in cooperation with the Government, in peace with your conscience, but above all to the glory of our motherland. . . .

I-A.R , 1942, II, p 60-1.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Speech to the National Council, February 24, 1942

. . . Poland has entered upon the path of political realism with determination. Proceeding in this spirit the Polish Government was the first to stretch out her hand to Soviet Russia, proposing friendship. For the same reason we have taken the initiative in signing with Czechoslovakia an agreement that should become the foundation of a future European union towards the establishment of which we are making further efforts. An honest understanding with the Soviets should ensure a lasting security for Poland. Otherwise — as the course of history has proved — we would be doomed to simultaneous struggles on two fronts, and the prospect would be dark indeed. This understanding will be no less beneficial to the other side. A strong Poland will be capable of withholding the everlasting German *Drang nach Osten*. It will afford our neighbor an opportunity of accomplishing great tasks and furthering the development of the enormous areas and untold wealth of the U S S R.

Unquestionably the possibilities of Russia in this regard are boundless. I am therefore confident that the differences that still divide us will disappear. The agreements we have concluded have already yielded many practical advantages. I would like to draw your attention to one question which is all important to both parties. It is the organization of a Polish army upon Russian territory. That army is intended to fight as a unit on the Eastern front together with the Soviet army against our common foe, the Germans, to free independent and democratic Poland. . . .

The final solution of problems that are the outgrowth of history, and of the situation of Poland and Russia, is not a task for present days. Our first and foremost obligation is to crush our common foe. . . .

Besides our efforts for victory, we must work harder to draw new outlines for the political, social and economic organization of our State, immediately after the restoration of its independence, and thereby protect, once and for all, our country against a catastrophe similar to that of 1939. And if, at the outset I stated that this should be borne in mind by all, I did not omit those of my countrymen who hold particular responsibility during these events and even at the present moment, regardless of the dreadful ordeal to which our country is subjected, would still like to follow their selfish aims. This does not convey that the Government intends to shrink from honest consideration of criticism. On the contrary, the Government will expect criticism. The opposition has a right to comment, provided its comment is constructive and marked by a desire to serve the commonwealth. Such criticism will be welcome. On the other hand, there will be no place for wrangling prompted by personal ambitions. At the present moment, this would amount to a harmful, nay a criminal diversion. The Government expects that under the experienced leadership of its chairman the National Council will set the example of honest criticism and in the performance of its duties will fully meet its obligations to our country. After carefully considering the situation we have drawn up a declaration, unanimously accepted by the Government. It contains the main principles that guide us, and will continue to guide us during our future unflinching work for Poland. This declaration also clearly states our attitudes towards national and religious minorities, whose sufferings, especially those of the Jews, must evoke the sympathy of every civilized man. Their faithful attitude towards Poland will never be forgotten. The Declaration runs as follows:

The Government of national unity nominated by the President of the Republic in conformity with the Polish Constitution is the lawful execu-

tive authority of the Polish State. Considering itself as the instrument of the common will of all citizens of the Republic, to whose welfare it is solely devoted, the Government declares.

(1) The principal object of the Polish Government is to liberate their country and restore its due position among independent nations. It is pursuing this purpose by most effective participation of Poland and her armed forces in the war on the side of the fighting democracies, and by securing for Poland a broad direct access to the sea as well as frontiers that will fully guarantee the safety and prosperity of the Republic.

(2) Actively participating in the task of building a new world order, the Polish Government is governed by the principle that this new order must insure a just and lasting peace. Based upon the mutual collaboration of free nations and on their individual right to free existence, it should be protected by organized force in the service of right. Blocs of federated nations, rationally and purposely formed in Europe, will introduce and ensure this new order and safeguard the world from the danger of war. The Polish Government will demand the complete and effective disarmament of the aggressors, which would exclude any future aggression, as well as ask for the severe punishment of those responsible for the present war, that is to say, Germany and her allies. They must be made to suffer merited chastisement for the injustices, crimes, and destruction they have committed and at the same time must render full moral and material satisfaction to those whom they have wronged. This is enjoined by primary and eternal justice which must govern international relations

The future political and economic structure of Poland will be ultimately decided by the Parliament of free Poland, endowed with legislative power as soon as hostilities have ended. Today, however, when the moment approaches to decide upon post-war organization of the world and of Europe and when international opinion desires to know the nature of the future of Poland, in order to justify their confidence in that country, the Government of national unity declares:

(1) Poland will stand by Christian principles and culture.

(2) The Polish Republic will be a democratic republican State closely conforming to the principles of legal government, responsible to a true national assembly fully representative of the common will of the people and elected by the method of general equal and direct secret vote. The Polish nation unreservedly repudiates all systems of totalitarian government and all forms of dictatorship, as contrary to the principles of democracy.

(3) Poland will guarantee the rights and liberties of all citizens loyal

to the Republic, regardless of national, religious or racial differences. Coupled with equality of obligations, equality of rights will be assured to national minorities fulfilling their civic duties towards the State. They will be given the possibility of free political, cultural and social development. Full freedom of conscience and expression, of association and assembly, will be guaranteed to all. The exercise of justice will be independent of any influence on the part of the State executive authority.

(4) Post-war Poland will endeavor to ensure work and a fair livelihood to the whole population, thereby removing once and for all from her territory the scourge of unemployment. Every citizen will possess the right to work, as well as the duty to work, while retaining choice of occupation. The national economic policy will be guided by this principle. It will be subordinated to the general principles conforming with the necessity of planned post-war reconstruction and of industrial development and the mobilization of all productive forces vital to the general welfare. Sound agricultural reform, ensuring the just partition of land amongst the peasant population, should, with the exception of a limited number of model and experimental farms, create medium-sized but independent, profitable and productive farms, husbanded as a rule by the farmer's household. On the basis of these legislative, political, economic and social principles, we shall raise the standard of life of the working masses, peasants, workers and intellectual professions and assure to them their rightful cooperation in the development of our national culture.

(5) The general economic development of Poland was delayed for political reasons during the partitions and is suffering a setback by the occupation of the country. The Polish nation will make every effort to attain in the shortest possible time, the level of the Western European countries, and it desires to collaborate in this respect with other democratic nations.

(6) The spirit of self-sacrifice and of patriotism, as well as sound political judgment, of which our nation has given ample evidence during the war, demand that the whole public life of Poland be based upon the initiative and activities of the community itself. In particular the largest possible measure of public affairs should be left to the free administration and decision of local, economic and professional self-governments.

(7) Poland will possess a strong and efficient executive power, capable of taking speedy and determined action to frustrate any intentions hostile to Poland, and of rallying in times of danger all the vital forces of the country.

Upon these principles and following the resolutions of the National Council, appointed on the proposal of the Prime Minister by the President of the Republic, the Polish Government will work out detailed projects concerning the future political and economic structure of Poland for submission to Parliament immediately after its convocation

These are the principles on which we desire to base a new Poland. It is essential that they should be entirely fulfilled. From tragic experiences of these last years we come to the conclusion that even a Government which has at its disposal most powerful material force is not in a position to safeguard the interests of the State at an hour of distress if it is not supported by a confident and united nation

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 61-2.

Stanislaw Stronski, Minister of Information: Broadcast from London Commemorating the Signing of the Treaty of Peace between Poland and the Soviet Union at Riga in 1920, March 18, 1942

... the treaty of Riga effected a great territorial readjustment in which Poland, by adopting a realistic attitude, suffered tremendous losses in comparison with the past. The eastern frontier of Poland thus established in a spirit of lasting understanding was recognized by the Allied Powers with Great Britain at their head on March 15, 1923 and by the United States on April 5, 1923, during the period when Sikorski was Prime Minister of Poland. Now that we celebrate the twenty-first anniversary of the Treaty of Riga, we regard this readjustment of territory as final for the sake of good relations between the Polish Republic and Soviet Russia, and, as Lenin said, "no longer subject to vagaries of temporary military and diplomatic circumstances"

The Polish Review, 1942, II, 13, p. 12.

***Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Address at the Princeton Club, New York City, March 20, 1942*¹**

This is not the time for the settlement of future boundaries. Everything about us is in a flux. This is not the time for the consolidation of the future peaceful and permanent structure of the world. This can only come to pass when the clash of arms subsides after the United Nations' victory.

¹ See also Prime Minister Sikorski's Broadcast to the Conquered Nations, May 1942 (*The Polish Review*, 1942, II, 17, p. 2).

The strength of those nations, led by the United States and Great Britain, lies in faith and loyalty to the ideals and principles expressed in the Atlantic Charter. They are completed by the declaration signed in Washington on January 1, 1942. We have no right to sacrifice the lofty principles for which we are fighting together in full solidarity.

The Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of the United Nations are acts which must be accepted or rejected in their entirety. Not an element of them may be dropped. No principle of liberty and equality of the nations can become the object of bargaining or diplomatic compromise. In these ideals we are building a new world whose mainstay undoubtedly will be honesty. The honest observance of accepted obligations has always been the tradition of the United States. After my conversations in Washington, I feel convinced that it will continue to be so.

Poland's identical traditions inspire her intrepid and indomitable fight.

Fidelity to that banner will assure the full triumph of freedom and justice.

The Polish Review, 1942, II, 14, p. 2.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Address to the Polish National Council, following His Visit to the United States, London, April 21, 1942

. . . Poland has entered upon a path of political realism with determination. Proceeding in this spirit the Polish Government was the first to stretch out her hand to Soviet Russia, proposing friendship. For the same reason we have taken the initiative in signing with Czechoslovakia an agreement that *should become the foundation of a future European union towards the establishment of which we are making further efforts*. . . .

. . . My talks in Washington concerned also our plans on the post-war reconstruction of Central and Eastern Europe, and especially, the creation of a Central European Federation.

Without insuring law and order, and the economic rehabilitation of these territories — there can be no talk of durable peace. The Federal Blocs that are to come into existence in the future in this part of the world should possess essentially the structure and political body of the U. S. Government.

It is necessary to have a complete political, military, customs, and monetary union, as well as a common economic policy over the whole territory of the Confederation.

Only nations joined in such a union together with the western federations will be able to assure full control over the Germans. Otherwise, after winning the victory, Europe would be plunged into a new war 25 years hence. . . .

. . . In order that the blood spilled in this war may not be in vain, in order that after this catastrophe not only the sickness but its causes be permanently destroyed — we must make bold decisions! The world must be reorganized! The rights of small nations, just as the common economic policy must be safeguarded. A conscientiously planned and well-organized, real force must stand vigil to this new order. . . .

The Polish Review, 1942, II, 35, p. 8.

Polish National Council: Resolution Adopted following the Address of Prime Minister Sikorski, April 21, 1942

. . . (4) The National Council of the Polish Republic confirms that the entire Polish Nation is in accord with the Polish Government in its conviction that an indispensable condition of lasting, stable peace in Europe after destruction of Germany's military power is the setting up of close federative alliances of Central European nations situated between Baltic, Aegean and Adriatic Seas and expresses hope that the Governments' endeavors in the direction of realizing these alliances should achieve desired results as quickly as possible. . . .

The Polish Review, 1942, II, 35, p. 8.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Speech to the Polish National Council on the Anglo-Soviet Treaty, June 15, 1942

. . . The National Council undoubtedly realizes the international importance of this act which also directly concerns Poland. The treaty is a most important political and moral success for the United Nations as also for its signatories. It will sustain the strength of resistance in all countries occupied by Hitler and it will strengthen the fighting spirit of the Russian army. . . .

Through a realization of the principles which it contains, this treaty may have vast influence in settling post-war world relations. Without the Polish-Soviet Agreement of July 1941 it would not have been possible to conclude this Treaty in its present form. This confirms once again that the Polish Government's policy was right. This policy already goes back to June 19, 1940, not one but two years ago, when Ambassador Raczynski handed to Lord Halifax, then British Foreign Secretary, my Aide-Mémoire in which, after drawing all the conclusions

that had been imposed by the fall of France, I expressed the view that it was necessary to win over Russia to the Allied camp, and make use of Poles on Soviet Territory for our common fight against the Germans.

Foreseeing the events of today I did not hesitate, in spite of so many opponents, to hold out my hand to the Soviets with a view to agreement. I did that the very next day after the German attack, in my speech of June 23rd in which I described that event as extremely advantageous to Poland and the Allies. . . .

We started negotiations which ended with the conclusion of the Treaty of July 30. . . .

Great Britain on the other hand entered the war without being the object of aggression. She entered it in order to satisfy the demands of political morality and to carry out her international obligations, which really means, in order to carry out the Treaty uniting Great Britain and Poland. Great Britain entered the war of her own free will, with a clearly defined aim, which is the defense of political morality and international law.

That is a tremendous political and moral asset which Great Britain has accumulated in this war. By a strong confirmation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, by an extension of the principle of no territorial aggrandizement and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations, Great Britain has not only fully retained her moral stature but has increased it many times, and to this the Polish Government attaches the greatest importance for the future.

The Anglo-Russian Treaty represents a complete victory of those ideals for which the war is being fought. The Treaty foretells at the same time the political role of the Soviet Union in the construction of future peace and the cooperation of the Soviets in the coming economic reconstruction of Europe. . . .

When analyzing the Anglo-Russian treaty, we see that the pledges it contains are directed not only against Germany but against all States who are Germany's Allies. This excludes all possibility of negotiations not only with the present German regime, but even any other German Government which does not renounce clearly all aggressive intentions. From our viewpoint this is a clear advantage to us. The extension of the alliance against Germany for a period of twenty years is also highly advantageous.

It means that even a German Government that would renounce clearly all intentions of aggression and with which an armistice could be concluded would remain under constant suspicion for twenty years. The Treaty provides further promise of a general security system after the

end of the war. Pledges of both sides to cooperate in this matter and in the matter of the economic prosperity of Europe are conditioned by the provision that both sides will take into full account the interests of the United Nations and will not seek territorial conquests for themselves and will refrain from interference in the internal affairs of other states.

I am convinced that the Anglo-Russian Treaty will also have some influence on Polish-Soviet relations. Lately matters concerning the Polish population in Russia have been the subject of negotiation between us and the Soviet Government. The difficulties encountered are partly the result of real complications, arising from total war, but all these difficulties must be overcome. As both President Roosevelt and Cardinal Hinsley have stated, the attitude adopted towards Poland is the criterion of political morality in this war.

The cause of Poland has become a touchstone showing the degree of international cooperation to which any given nation is ready to subscribe. I am convinced that the Soviet Government is also aware of the importance of its attitude towards Poland. There are still and will be many contentious matters between Poland and Russia. It is necessary, however, to try to remove these differences. We believe that the fundamental problem will be settled in a way satisfactory to the vital interests of the Polish Nation, which is now being exterminated methodically and ruthlessly by the Germans.

Our Nation, now showing such great moral virtues, is undoubtedly entitled to have a great and strong Poland, a Poland which will face the West. Soviet statesmen have spoken about such a Poland on every occasion. I am fully conscious, while speaking to you today, that my Government has fulfilled its duties towards Poland honestly. I state with every confidence that Polish views and the Polish *raison d'état* have been fully taken into account in the Anglo-Russian treaty. Poles at home and abroad will accept this fact with satisfaction and, in view of the campaign against this Treaty, with feelings of relief. Poles are paying dearly, with their blood and sweat and with appalling suffering for victory. Now their faith, both in the military victory of the Allies and in the creation by them together with us, of a just, for all, and therefore lasting peace, will be further strengthened.

Polish Feature and News Service, No. 44.

Mutual Aid Agreement between the United States and Poland, July 1, 1942

[For form of master agreement see section United Nations, p. 10;
for text see *D. S. Bul.*, VI, p. 577-9.]

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister: Address on the Occasion of the First Anniversary of the Polish-Soviet Treaty, London, July 30, 1942

. . . Today a year has passed since we signed the first agreement with Soviet Russia. . . this agreement was to open a new era between Poland and Russia. Its object was to eliminate the misunderstandings of the past. It was based on Russia's recognition of the principle that a strong Poland is a necessity for a lasting balance of power in Europe. It also contains our unchallengeable right to manage our home affairs freely, in accordance with the wishes of the people of the Polish Republic. Moreover, the statement that the Germans are our irreconcilable enemies, with whom we shall carry on a relentless fight until its victorious conclusion, is one of the chief pillars of our mutual understanding. These are the guiding principles, both of the agreement of July 30th and the military treaty of August 14th and also of my agreement with Stalin of December 4th,¹ which was received with satisfaction by the Soviet people.

The Polish Government will remain faithful to these principles. Their application will guarantee a better future to the nations living in Central and Eastern Europe. They are completely confirmed by the Anglo-Russian Treaty of May 26th, and are accepted and fully supported by the United States of America. . . .

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 202.

Wladyslaw Raczekiewicz, President: Broadcast to the Polish Nation on the Third Anniversary of Germany's Invasion of Poland, London, September 9, 1942

. . . Side by side with her Allies, Poland is entering upon the fourth year of war, fighting ceaselessly at home and on almost every front. She enters it with the same will to fight and defend her honor that she displayed on the first day of German aggression, and with the same ultimate aim, not to lose her vital right to independent existence on the whole of her territory, and to obtain such conditions as will make this existence more lasting and secure than heretofore.

With this as the ultimate aim of her national war effort, Poland also strives for the closest post-war cooperation with all her friends and Allies, with equal rights and obligations in the new world structure. Poland measures her own aims and those of other Allied Nations or nations temporarily deprived of their freedom with the same yardstick. The basic principles of international morality, taking full account of

¹ See p. 361.

the necessity of creating unions or confederations of States having similar aims, must be restored after the war, in the course of which they have been trampled underfoot; and these principles of morality must form the basis of the future peace.

This peace should provide ways and means of giving territorial, strategic and economic security to States like Poland which are exposed to the danger of German aggression . . .

On the threshold of the fourth year of war, I wish to assure the Allied Nations and their Governments on behalf of the Republic of Poland that my country and the Polish Government will never shrink from the path of an uncompromising fight for final victory. Both as a State and as a nation we act in unison with all the Allied Nations and countries. Some of them used to be distant from us, now they are close to us, and united with us by our common struggle and our common fate. The Polish nation is unanimous, in face of the problems of the hour and the tasks of the future. Unity remains imperative for our whole country, for the Government and all Poles in exile. . . .

Polish Feature and News Service, No. 51.

***Decree on the Punishment of German War Crimes Committed in Poland, Approved by the Polish Cabinet on October 17, 1942*¹**

The decree provides:

1. Criminal responsibility attaches to those persons belonging to the German Reich or to States allied to, or connected with it, as well as to persons in the service of the German Reich or of such States, during the war for all crimes committed after August 31, 1939.

2. All acts committed in violation of international law and harmful to the Polish State, to Polish institutions, firms, or citizens, will be punished by imprisonment.

3. The punishment inflicted will be increased to life imprisonment or the death penalty will be imposed, if such actions caused death, special suffering, deportation, transfers of population, imprisonment of individuals, general danger to human life, compulsory military service in foreign armies or the destruction of or damage to property of general national value.

4. Persons giving orders for criminal acts will be equally subject to punishment with the persons performing such acts.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 299.

¹ See Stanislaw Stronski's statement, October 14, 1942 (Polish Information Center, New York).

*Henryk Strasburger, Minister of Finance, Industry and Commerce:
Speech at Philadelphia, November 16, 1942*

. . . The movements of population in Europe will present one of the most formidable problems the United Nations will have to deal with. It will be necessary to take into account:

1. Prisoners of war.
2. War refugees, i e , the people who fled their homes before or during military operations.
3. People deported by the invaders from their homes and transferred to other regions.
4. German, Italian, Hungarian, etc., settlers transferred to the regions from which native populations have been deported.
5. People sent from occupied countries to forced labor in Germany.
6. Refugees who emigrated during the period 1933-39 because of political persecutions.

It can therefore be taken for granted that in the first few months after the cessation of hostilities there will be enormous movements of people both nationally and internationally all over Europe.

These movements will need to be carefully handled and special aid organized for them not only for their own sakes, but for the effect they may have on general relief plans in Europe.

One condition of such migrations is the establishment of national frontiers. Even in Germany annexation preceded deportation in Poland. So it seems essential to me that at the time of the armistice definite frontiers of various States should already be established. . . .

This vast movement of peoples is only one of the tasks which awaits Europe and the whole world in the sphere of transport after the war. The supply of food and raw materials is also essentially a transport problem. Shipment of food and raw materials to Europe will call for an enormous amount of tonnage. The Inter-Allied Committee has already estimated the tonnage that will be available after the war. It is even more difficult to foresee what land transport facilities will exist in Europe. All available information indicates that rail and road conditions in Europe are steadily deteriorating. . . .

Release from Polish Information Center, New York.

General War Aims as Formulated by the Polish National Council, London, December 2, 1942

. . . In question of our Eastern frontiers the National Council holds to the basis of the Riga Treaty of 1920. Where Germany is concerned

it declares that the fundamental principles of Polish policy is to strive to secure Europe against a new German aggression. For this purpose Poland should maintain the security of her frontiers as well as the peaceful conditions for her economic and cultural development by having a large access to the sea and by obtaining frontier with Germany which should be extended sufficiently towards west as well as straightened and shortened. In order to ensure the lasting peace for Europe and a free development for nations it is necessary to create in Central Eastern Europe a close union of states united by common interests and aims. Therefore the National Council demands that the Government should take up this matter immediately and clearly in all quarters concerned and among them with the British and American quarters.

Copy received from Polish Information Center, New York.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister and Commander-in-Chief: Press Conference, during His Third Visit to the United States since 1939, Chicago, December 18, 1942

Questions:

... 1. What are Poland's post-war territorial aims? What is the attitude of the Polish Government towards minorities?

2. Has any territorial understanding with Russia been reached?

3. How closely are Poland and Czechoslovakia working on post-war collaboration? Are similar steps being taken with other governments?

Answer: Poland has no territorial claims as regards frontiers with Russia. Poland is fighting Germany, and is anxious to maintain friendly relations with Russia. This, I think, is in harmony with the views of Stalin, as expressed to me during my visit at the Kremlin in December 1941.

Territorial claims affecting Poland made from time to time by the Comintern are of no strategic importance to Russia. On the contrary, a strong Poland, maintaining friendly relations with Russia, will undoubtedly be the best safeguard of Russia against the century-old German "Drang nach Osten."

The Polish nation has lived up to its high ideals in this war, as in the past. Poland must regain her independence, as one of the essential elements of a just and permanent peace. To ensure peace, Poland must have a wider access to the Baltic Sea. Her security will require certain

frontier adjustments in the West, in accordance with the Atlantic Charter, to safeguard territory inhabited by people of Polish origin who for centuries have been exposed to ruthless Germanization.

Poland will have a democratic form of government along the lines of the United States and the British Commonwealth. All Polish citizens will be equal and all, regardless of origin, race or creed, will have the four freedoms, equal rights, and equal obligations

The Polish Government, under my leadership, favors Confederation of Central and Eastern Europe. This is in accord with Poland's traditions. As far back as the 16th century, Poland had formed a successful federation of neighboring states. The Polish Government seeks a Confederation of Poland with Czechoslovakia to work in close harmony with the Confederation planned between Greece and Yugoslavia. These confederations may become the basis of a future federation of nations between the Baltic and the Adriatic and Aegean Seas, securing Central and Eastern Europe against further German aggression, and safeguarding Russia on her western borders. Such a federation would undoubtedly improve economic collaboration in Europe. The raising of the standard of living in this area, inhabited by more than 100,000,000 people with access both to the Baltic and Mediterranean Seas, would open vast markets to American business enterprise.

Question: I would like to ask the General's views on the problem of East Prussia.

Answer: Mr. Junosza has read the answer of the Prime Minister which covers this question.

Question: We have received what we consider reliable information that Poland will be divided after the war, part of Poland going to Russia.

Answer: I can assure you that there is no such understanding, and the partition of Poland between Germany and Russia, before Germany attacked Russia, is null and void under the treaty signed between Poland and Russia. The first paragraph of that agreement is quite explicit. It was on that basis and to cope with such great issues that I and my Government decided to overlook past wrongs, to conclude this pact and to work for friendly relations with Russia. . . .

Question: Has Poland any plan for occupying any part of Germany after the war is over, other than East Prussia?

Answer: This matter has not yet been settled between the United Nations and the question of how and for how long Germany shall be occupied is yet to be decided, but as it ripens Poland undoubtedly will play her part in the occupation. I hope that Polish armies will be used for the occupation of all German territory east of the Oder. . . .

Question: I would like to ask whether General Sikorski feels that this is a war against Hitlerism or against the German nation as such, and that there must be a thorough-going re-education of the German nation after this war.

Answer: I do not suppose any one doubts what my reply as Chief of the Polish Government will be. We have a long score to settle with the Germans. As yet we see no opposition on the part of the German people to the Hitler regime. The German nation has rallied entirely and very compactly around Hitler, who cannot be regarded as a symbol or as a temporary phenomenon. Hitler is the expression of the deep-rooted lust of conquest of the German people. With the greatest regret I now see that even German education, which I once admired, is now entirely at the service of Hitler and his aids. German professors, who had been received most hospitably and shown all of Poland's art treasures, are today in our universities that have been closed by the Germans, and they are directing the looting of our libraries and laboratories, of our art galleries and museums. Those German professors and scientists have also placed themselves at the service of Hitler and Himmler to devise the best means for the extermination of peoples, and these methods are being now applied in the mass murders of the Jewish people. Germany is, unfortunately, a nation poisoned to its very core. First it must be rendered harmless. Germany must be more completely disarmed than was the case after the last war, and she must be deprived of all means of rearming. After that, methods of re-education will have to be applied to root out the Nazi teachings from the minds of a generation that has now become pagan and Hitlerized. That will take time. . . .

Question: How does the Prime Minister contemplate Polish-Czech cooperation after this war?

Answer: I and my Government are anxious to arrive at a full confederation between the two countries. On the other hand quite recently the conclusion of a twenty-year alliance between the two countries has been suggested, but in my opinion this would not be sufficient. It would be too much like the agreements that followed the last war, which proved totally inadequate for security. This war is so terrific and the stakes are so great that we must discard the small things that divide us and concentrate upon the vital interests that unite us. We hope sincerely that Confederation will be possible.

. . . *Question:* How does the Prime Minister foresee the re-education of the Germans and their reformation? How long will it take?

Answer: The Germans must be put into quarantine, and it may last a long time. . . .

. . . From some of the questions asked me today, I feel there is still a good deal of misconception. This war is not about frontiers. This war is a "to be or not to be" war for Western civilization. We shall win this war, but I do not want it to end in such a way that in twenty-five years hence we shall again have to appeal to the United States to come and help us. That is why we must strive for a constructive ideal, the idea of confederation. . . .

The Polish Review, III, 1, p. 2, 15.

Wladyslaw Sikorski, Prime Minister and Commander-in-Chief: Address to a Meeting of all Polish Organizations, Arranged by the Polish American Council, Chicago, December 1942

. . . The inviolability of our frontiers — wider than before the war — a broader access to the sea — these are the aims for which Polish soldiers are fighting and for which the Polish Nation is bleeding.

The confederative idea encounters great difficulties. I do not believe we need to study all the difficulties of Europe in London or Washington, and then bring them to the continent. Now is the time for all governments that find themselves in the same place, to take advantage of their proximity to come to an understanding and start a new conception of world organization. Humanity is not shedding its blood to return to old, pre-war ideas, but to new and hundredfold better conceptions. Let us hope that this time the militant hydra of Germanism will be rendered totally harmless.

The Polish-Russian pact has evoked much comment. I wish to reassure you. Those who criticize it do not know the elements of the decision made by the Government. We planned it as a broad and long-term policy. Thus far, we have lost nothing by this and have raised Polish prestige very high. Had not this pact existed, the British-Soviet pact of May 1942 would not have materialized. The results of the latter would have been quite different and a hundred percent worse for us.

Who knows whether our pact with Russia and the agreements entered upon with Russia later, are not a turning point in the life of the entire Nation.

I wish it sincerely. The future fate of our agreement depends on the behavior of Soviet Russia. Such possibilities do exist, as is evidenced by the numerous telegrams received by me, although there are great difficulties. However, no great things are achieved without difficulties. . . .

General Sikorski's Speeches during his Visit to the United States, Polish Information Center, December 1942.

3. NORWAY

Norway is a constitutional monarchy. The King, Haakon VII, was elected to the throne by Parliament, November 18, 1905, following the establishment of Norway as a separate kingdom. The present Cabinet (Statsraad) was constituted by the Labor Party on March 20, 1935 and was continued in office by the elections of 1936.

1940

- Apr. 8 Attack by German naval forces.
- “ 9 Invasion by German troops by sea and air. German Minister presented demands for occupation of strategic points, which were rejected. Warfare began.
The King and the Cabinet left Oslo. The *Storting* (Parliament) assembled at Elverum, and unanimously granted full powers to the King and Cabinet for the duration of the emergency
- Jun. 7 King Haakon VII, the Crown Prince and the Cabinet left Norway. They established themselves in London where the Cabinet was reorganized as a Coalition.
- “ 9 Norwegian army ceased hostilities.
- “ 10 The King and Cabinet pledged that the war would be continued until Norway was freed.

1941

- May 28 Agreement of Royal Norwegian Government with Great Britain affirming their joint determination to prosecute the war to a successful end and to re-establish the independence of Norway. The agreement also laid down principles concerning the organization and employment of Norwegian armed forces.¹
- Dec. 7 Diplomatic relations with Finland severed.
- “ 9 Diplomatic relations with Japan severed.

1942

- Jan. 13 Declaration on punishment of war crimes signed.
- Jul. 11 Mutual aid agreement with the United States (see p. 497).
- Oct. 9 Renunciation of claims to extraterritoriality in China and announcement of forthcoming treaty to that effect.²

King Haakon VII and Johan Nygaardsvold, Prime Minister: Proclamation, April 10, 1940³

. . . It [the Norwegian Government] now turns to the whole Norwegian people, and asks their assistance in upholding a rule of the country according to law — Norwegian constitution, Norwegian liberty, Norwegian independence . . .

The Norwegian Government is convinced that this crime is condemned by the whole civilized world. But above all it is confident that

¹ No official text has yet been issued; see *The Times*, May 29, 1941, p. 2

² *Christian Science Monitor*, October 27, 1942, p. 1

³ See also Halvdan Koht, Norwegian Foreign Minister: Broadcast from London on May 5, 1940 (*Norway and the War*, p. 97-103).

the Norwegian nation will use all its energies to restore the liberty and independence which a foreign power has wished to destroy by force.

The outlook for Norway may seem dark at this moment, and the masters of force may succeed in destroying much. But the Government has the confident hope that a new and brighter future for the country will one day appear

It therefore exhorts the whole Norwegian nation to cling fast to the Norwegian heritage of liberty in loyalty to the great ideas which have carried our country forward for centuries

Long live our fatherland! Long live a free Norway!

JOHAN NYGAARDSVOLD

I associate myself completely with this appeal which the Government has addressed to the Norwegian people. I am convinced that I have the whole nation with me in the decision which has been taken

HAAKON R.

Norway and the War, p. 64-5.

Proclamation by the Norwegian Government, April 28, 1940

. . . The Norwegian Government trusts that the ideas of justice and liberty will conquer in the end. It knows that breaches of law and acts of violence can cause great damage to the country. But it knows with equal certainty that the Norwegian people will not on that account surrender the freedom which the Constitution of 1814 has founded in Norway.

The Norwegian Government is saying nothing new when it proclaims: The struggle for independence goes on.

Norway and the War, p. 90-1.

King Haakon VII and Johan Nygaardsvold, Prime Minister: Appeal to the Norwegian People, June 7, 1940

We who send this call to you at the moment when we are compelled to abandon the soil of Norway are resolved to place all our forces, our lives, and all we possess at the disposal of Norway's cause. We believe that we shall soon be able to come back to a free and independent Norway, and we hope to be able to do this with honor. The thought which will govern all our action abroad, and which we know we share with all who remain at home lies in the words:

Long live Norway! All for Norway!

HAAKON R.

JOHAN NYGAARDSVOLD

Norway and the War, p. 119-20.

Carl J. Hambro, President of the Storting: Broadcast¹ from London, June 22, 1940

... It was on June 7 that the King and his Council left Norway. And in a very real sense this particular day was historically appropriate. The work of national liberation could no longer be carried out in Norway. Only by choosing a site where they could act freely were they in a position to work for the political future of the land, or to take care of its economic interests, or make a contribution to provide help to the whole occupied country which may come to be threatened by hunger and need. Heavy trials await us all, heaviest for those who are living under the pressure of a foreign power within the frontiers of the country, cut off from every opportunity of independent examination of the facts and all access to those proud utterances on the subject of government which the Constitution presents. Their power to hold out, their willingness to obey the spirit of the national laws instead of the dictates of foreign power, may for painful years to come decide the fate of Norway.

We outside the country are more fortunate than they because we have only lost everything except our right to free thought and free speech and to follow our conviction and the voice of our conscience unhindered; we follow them with our deepest sympathy, with a fellow-feeling which shares their lot, convinced that every Norwegian from the bottom of his heart at this time feels that there is one goal for our wishes and our determination: one country, one people, one King.

Norway and the War, p. 123-5; *The Times*, June 25, 1940.

King Haakon VII: Broadcast from London, August 26, 1940

It was clear to me and to the Government that the only possibility of recreating a free Norway is the victory of that side which like us maintains the right of the small nations to live their own lives.

Norway and the War, p. 139, *The Times*, August 27, 1940, p. 3.

Proclamation to the Norwegian People, September 26, 1940²

... The struggle in the cause of freedom and independence shall not be given up. The King continues to be Norway's King, even though the German Reichskommissar declares him deposed. And the Government

¹ *Ny Norsk Kvitbok*. Translation.

² Approved by the King and Government, and broadcast from London by the Prime Minister Nygaardsvold, *Norsk Tidend*, September 27, 1940 Translation.

which he has lawfully appointed, and to which the Storting in its last meeting gave its unanimous vote of confidence, is still the legal Government of the country and continues its task in accordance with the authority given it by the Storting.

In the name and on behalf of the people, the King and the Government will continue the struggle until the country has won back freedom and independence. It is their national duty, and they know that they have the Norwegian people strongly and vigorously with them, when they thus work and fight for its vital needs outside the frontiers of the country. In the certainty that they are the true representatives of the people's will to freedom, they cry to the Norwegian people at home:

Stand fast and endure in loyalty to the free Constitution of Norway, and together we shall win the victory of all Norwegians.

HAAKON R.

JOHAN NYGAARDSVOLD

Norway and the War, p. 142-3.

Halvdan Koht, Foreign Minister: Broadcast to the Polish People from London, November 18, 1940

Everyone of us knows that without a free, reborn, independent Poland, there will be no free Europe liberated from the nightmare of aggression.

New Europe, December 1, 1940, p. 10.

***Trygve Lie, Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs: Broadcast from London, December 15, 1940*¹**

. . . The fight for freedom and independence can only succeed in close cooperation with other free nations.

Such cooperation is nothing new to us. Before the war we were connected closely — economically and culturally — with other Nordic peoples. . . . We hope sometime to re-establish this cooperation in new forms. We hope then to bring in our kinsfolk on the Atlantic islands of Iceland and the Farøe Isles, with whom we have great common interests.

The cooperation we need is above all that which binds us more firmly to the Western peoples with whom we of old are connected with natural economic ties. Our prosperity, our economic future, the thriving of our community, is entirely dependent on this. The nations to whom we have been most firmly bound economically are peoples with the same

¹ Mr. Lie expressed similar ideas in an article in *Norsk Tidend*, December 17, 1940 (Translation in *Norway and the War*, p. 145-6)

traditions of freedom as ourselves. First of all there is the British Empire, the greatest commonwealth of nations ever formed; and there is the powerful and rich union of the United States of America. There are all the nations which for the time being have lost their independence, but like ourselves are looking forward to the day of liberation from the foreign yoke. And there is Greece, which is winning such conspicuous victories over a much stronger enemy.

This is a mighty alliance which our allies and all freedom-loving forces in the world are laboring to build up and strengthen. And it is work which is at the same time forming the basis for the state which must and shall endure after the war: the political cooperation which will secure our national freedom and protect us against attacking tyrants, which economically establishes social security and prevents crises from destroying economic life and stopping social developments.

To make this possible one thing must not be forgotten: our future is not being shaped by our wishes and our plans, but above all by our active share in the war to liberate Europe. We used to take our independence for granted. Now we have learnt that we cannot have it for nothing, that we must be prepared to defend it.

If we want to be given influence in the new world after the war we must do our duty and shoulder our share in this war as far as our strength goes.

We shall now, with other free nations, try to find new forms for international cooperation which will have greater chances to succeed . . . It will be something quite different from that which the present Germany is trying to force upon us. We are a seafaring nation and an Atlantic people, and our inclusion in a continental bloc could mean nothing to us but economic ruin. The specific Norwegian culture which has been built up through hundreds of years of hard work would be destroyed, and everything that is Norwegian and of which we are rightly proud would disappear.

I-A.R., 1941, I, 1, p. 11; *The Times*, December 16, 1940.

Report on Agreement between the United Kingdom and Norway, signed by Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and Trygve Lie, Royal Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs, London, May 28, 1941

In the agreement, the two governments affirm their determination to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion, . . .

Great Britain and Norway further agree that one of the objects of the war is the re-establishment of the freedom and independence of the

Kingdom of Norway through its complete liberation from German domination. . . .

The agreement further covers the organization and employment of the Norwegian armed forces in the United Kingdom. The two governments recognize the importance in their common interest of maintaining the armed forces of Norway, and have agreed on the principles on which these forces will be used in practical cooperation with the Allied forces.

I-A.R., 1941, I, 5, p. 12, *New York Herald Tribune*, May 29, 1941.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London: Trygve Lie, Foreign Minister: Speech Accepting the Resolution, June 12, 1941

I should be glad to express the sincere satisfaction of the Royal Norwegian Government with the unanimous decision of the Allied Governments to continue to fight for the common cause until complete victory is won. I think we all realize that our countries cannot regain their national liberty until this goal has been reached. And in order to reach it and reach it without undue delay we will have to work together as hard as we can. It is a fact that the greatest task is that which falls to the British Empire. It is therefore particularly gratifying to us that our British allies who carry the heaviest burden are the ones who have taken the initiative in drafting this resolution embodying as it does the principles for which we are all fighting. The Governments whose representatives have come together here today are responsible for the warfare carried on by our fighting forces, and we know the excellent spirit prevailing among them. But we also know that the peoples of our countries at home who are not at the moment in a position to put up a physical fight against the aggressors, are with us today in their hearts, and that their spirit too is undaunted. We know therefore, when we today solemnly declare the solidarity of our efforts, that we do so in the name of the nations which we represent.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without underlining the importance which my Government attaches to point 3 of the resolution before us. We are convinced that a happier future can only come to us through the collaboration of all the free peoples in a world in which all men may enjoy individual liberty joined with economic and social security.

U. K., Cmd. 6285, Misc. No. 1 (1941), p. 7-8;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 5, p. 4.

King Haakon VII: Broadcast from London to the People of Norway, July 11, 1941

Every impartial observer knows that the attack on Russia is above all a part of Germany's struggle for world domination, and what this would mean for Norway I need not tell you at home, for you are daily witnessing the suppression of everything that Norwegians throughout the ages have cherished most: liberty and independence.

If Germany should be victorious, it would mean oppression and serfdom for Norway and for the rest of the world. The way in which the Germans have secured a foothold in our country in all fields of life and the brutality with which they trample on our most sacred possessions is sufficient proof of this.

With this clearly in mind it is not difficult to see that anyone helping Germany in her fight against Russia is assisting Germany in her fight against the liberation of our own country from the German yoke.

We are at war with Germany. The Germans are our enemies. Our relation with Finland must not be allowed to obscure this fact, and no propaganda must deceive you.

No one knows how long this fight for right and justice against brutal force and against lies will last, but I am convinced that in this war right alone is not enough; the decisive factor is guns, tanks and aeroplanes. However, if faith in right and justice for community and nations is lost, life has lost its worth.

In conclusion I want to say just this: Hold out. Don't lose courage. And be assured that Norway will once again be free and independent, provided that we all continue to do our duty and our utmost to reach our goal in the battle which is now being fought.

News of Norway, 1941, I, 27, p. 1-2.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Trygve Lie, Foreign Minister: Speech Accepting the First Resolution (Atlantic Charter), September 24, 1941

My Government have most sincerely welcomed the meeting which has taken place between Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt. Every step taken with a view to securing full and wholehearted collaboration between the two great Anglo-Saxon world powers is of a nature to raise hopes in the oppressed countries of a more speedy deliverance from foreign domination. Nowhere are such hopes more likely to be kindled than in Norway, where Nazi tyranny has recently shown itself more undisguised than ever before.

The Norwegian Prime Minister, Mr. Nygaardsvold, has already made a statement to the press associating himself with the ideas expressed in the joint declaration which was the outcome of the meeting, and which was published on August 14.

It is obvious that a people with the historic traditions of Norway is longing for a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 13-15;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 5-6.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Arne Sunde, Minister of Supply: Speech Accepting the Second Resolution (Post-war Economic Needs of Europe), September 24, 1941

Already last autumn the Royal Norwegian Government officially expressed the opinion that it would be imperative to organize as early as possible a post-war economic cooperation in order to safeguard us against grave economic crises and also to lay a solid foundation for a durable prosperity for all nations. It would seem natural that this work should prepare the solution of the tasks with which we will be faced immediately after the war.

The first question we shall have to deal with concerns the supplies of food, raw materials, and articles of prime necessity to the European countries after the war, and the utilization of the tonnage which will be at our disposal for this purpose. We therefore sincerely welcome the initiative taken by the British Government and we will vote for the draft resolution submitted to us.

We did not originally fully understand the meaning of point 3 of the draft resolution, but it is now perfectly clear to us that this point does not imply any responsibility of the Norwegian Government for decisions taken previously and without consultation with them. We can therefore give our assent also to point 3 of the draft resolution.

The Norwegian Government attach great importance to point 5, which regards shipping. We hope that in this respect we shall have the opportunity of making a considerable contribution and are therefore particularly interested in taking our share of the direction of, and the responsibility for, this part of the work.

We are also happy to support the proposal concerning the establishment of a consultative bureau and are willing to appoint a liaison officer to secure the collaboration between this bureau and our Government.

It appears from the proposal that the intention is to give to the Allied Governments the possibility of consulting this bureau when they are framing estimates of their requirements after the war, and that the bureau shall "collate and coordinate these estimates." Such a bureau would certainly prove most useful, particularly when placed under the chairmanship of Sir Frederick Leith-Ross. We quite agree that the establishment of such a bureau only constitutes the first step and we note with satisfaction that there will also be set up a committee consisting of representatives of all the Allied Governments.

We, as well as the other Allied Governments, are earnestly desirous of seeing this work being executed in the closest contact with the Government of the United States. To maintain, and develop, this contact would be one of the most important tasks of the inter-Allied committee, and we hope that the United States Government will, in a not too distant future, find themselves able to participate actively in the collaboration so established. We feel convinced that the work which is now being initiated will be characterized by good will and mutual confidence, and that it will prove useful to all free nations in the whole world.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 26-7;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 10.

Trygve Lie, Foreign Minister: Summary of His Article "When Peace Returns" in The Times (London), November 14, 1941

Intimate international cooperation will be needed after the war in the political, military, and economic fields. Norway has no frontier problems, and no desire for territorial expansion. But the Norwegian people have been convinced that the policy of neutrality is bankrupt. The first question is, with whom shall we cooperate?

Happily our strategic position, our economic interests, our ideals, and our "way of life" all point in the same direction. There has not been the conflict between ideological and strategic considerations which has shown itself in the other Northern countries; there has been intimate collaboration between Norway and her neighbors in the years preceding the war, and it is, naturally, our desire to maintain the relations of good neighborliness. I should also like to stress the fact that Norway has lived on friendly, neighborly terms with Russia for many hundreds of years. . . .

As an Atlantic people we want above all a strong, organized collaboration between the two great Atlantic powers: the British Empire and the United States. This is our primary concern and the very condition of our participation in any international order in Europe.

The most important basis for extended international cooperation in the future is an amicable relationship between the British Empire, the United States, Soviet Russia, and China. But this time such movements must be organized to ensure practical results. We have all discussed the reasons why the League of Nations did not succeed in carrying out the task assigned to it. It would have been possible to use the League machinery against Italian and German aggression if the leading powers in the League had seriously wanted to do so. Countries adopted, however, a shortsighted policy of self-interest, and in an atmosphere of pacific public opinion nobody was willing to run any risks. This produced an inevitable disillusionment and a critical attitude towards the idea of a community of nations.

It is therefore essential that the new international cooperation should be built upon firm and safe ground. Since we are at war it would be natural to start with military collaboration. After the war the Allied countries will have important policing duties to perform in common, especially in relation to Germany, though much will depend on what sort of Germany we shall have to deal with. The Atlantic Charter, which has been approved by all the Allied Governments, lays down that unilateral disarmament of Germany shall be enforced during the period immediately following the war, but that the German people shall not be starved.

For a shorter or a longer period it will, in any case, be necessary to keep Germany under military occupation, and here the Allied forces will have a common task.

Such military cooperation, however, should be developed to continue in the future. An agreement should be reached for all the Allied countries to take over certain duties. As far as the smaller States are concerned, these duties should be primarily regional. For Norway it seems natural to think of the defense of the Atlantic and strongly to emphasize our desire to see the United States participating in this task. Military and political questions being closely connected, we must also work together in the political tasks which will have to be tackled after the war; not least in connection with the peace settlement. The inter-Allied conferences which have taken place recently have created the beginnings of a common political machinery. They might perhaps be developed into a real inter-Allied committee holding regular meetings and having, so far as possible, executive powers.

Such an organization would be only provisional. In the interval there will be time to discuss plans for an extended form of cooperation, either in the form of a new League of Nations or a federal body. It is, however,

very important that no country should be forced to join such an organization whether by pressure from outside or in any other way. As a preliminary, reconstruction work must be carried on internationally, and no new body should be founded except on a demand from the people of all countries. It might be difficult to induce people who have carried on a long struggle for their national freedom to give up, so to say, part of their sovereignty. It should, on the other hand, be much easier to make them accept concrete proposals understood by all to be necessary, as, for example, military cooperation.

The details of future economic cooperation must be governed by certain simple facts. One is that political stability is impossible without international economic collaboration; and the other is that the world will certainly not return to the old liberal economic system. The war has made necessary in all countries a national planned economy under the direction of the State; and in the years immediately following we shall be faced with tremendous tasks of economic reconstruction. The first will be to supply the whole European continent with consumption goods for which there will be an urgent need; the next, to supply them with the means of production, to make it possible to start the wheels turning again. This second task should be carried out according to a common plan, so that each country, so far as possible, can restart the economic activity most suited to it. Thus a step will have been taken towards an international planned economy, and afterwards will come the regulation of markets and common plans for opening up new markets. Here is a much more important matter than the access to raw materials of which so much has been heard.

In Norway we have our special task within the planned economy of the future. Norwegian shipping has never received subsidies in any form; it has, on the contrary, been heavily taxed. If, nevertheless, it has been able to maintain a prominent place in the face of severe competition, that is entirely due to its high quality in leadership, crews, and equipment. We have our fisheries and timber industries; we have also enormous quantities of unused water power. All these are industries especially suited to us, and we hope they will be given the prominent place they deserve within the planned economy of the future.

For the time being the inter-Allied committee will deal only with questions of supplies in the immediate post-war period; but there is nothing to prevent its being developed into a permanent organ. Steps should be taken now to extend the inter-Allied machinery, pending the inclusion of other States after the war. As yet both the political and the economic machinery are purely provisional. No step has been taken to

establish any inter-Allied military machinery. Though this may encounter special difficulties, it should not be impossible, even now, to prepare effective union between Great Britain and the Allied countries in certain regional tasks.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 56-8; *The Times*, November 14, 1941.

Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, London, January 13, 1942

[For text see United Nations, p. 7.]

Mutual Aid Agreement between the Government of the United States and the Royal Norwegian Government, July 11, 1942

[For text see *D. S. Bul*, VI, p. 609-11. For master agreement see section United Nations, p. 10]

Wilhelm Munthe de Morgenstierne, Ambassador to the United States: Letter to Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, July 11, 1942

I have the honor to refer to the conversations between representatives of the Royal Norwegian Government and the Government of the United States of America in connection with the negotiation of the Agreement on the Principles Applying to Mutual Aid in the Prosecution of the War Against Aggression signed this day.

During the course of these conversations the Norwegian representatives have referred to the fact that the Royal Norwegian Government has been driven from its country by Hitler, whose forces are in occupation of the country and are despoiling its resources. They have pointed out that the principal national asset remaining at the disposal of their Government is the Norwegian Merchant Fleet, which that Government is operating for the benefit of the United Nations in the common war effort; that for the protection and maintenance of that Fleet, it is necessary to install armaments and other protective devices and equipment upon its vessels, and to repair damage and replace losses thereto occasioned by acts of war and operation under war conditions; that it will also be necessary for the Royal Norwegian Government, when the invader has been driven from its territory, to ensure the maintenance of re-established peaceful conditions, and that, for this reason, the need of the Royal Norwegian Government for arms and equipment will not necessarily cease with the general cessation of hostilities.

The conversations referred to have disclosed a mutual understanding on the part of the Royal Norwegian Government and the Government

of the United States of America with respect to the application of certain provisions of the Agreement signed this day, as follows:

1. Armaments and other protective devices and equipment installed upon Norwegian ships subsequent to December 7, 1941 shall, under the provisions of the Agreement signed this day, remain the property of the Government of the United States of America. The installation of such armaments, protective devices, and other equipment shall be at the expense and for the account of the Government of the United States of America, which shall bear any risk of loss, or damage, and shall not be regarded as giving rise to any financial obligation on the part of the Royal Norwegian Government. Such armaments may, if found mutually desirable, be manned by American gun crews.

2. The repair under the Lend-Lease Act, subsequent to December 7, 1941, of damage to Norwegian ships which is caused by acts of war or by operation under war conditions, as well as repair and replacement necessitated by operation under war conditions shall be made at the expense and for the account of the Government of the United States of America, and shall not be regarded as giving rise to any financial obligation on the part of the Royal Norwegian Government. The repair of damage not caused by acts of war or not necessitated by operation under war conditions shall be made at the expense and for the account of the Royal Norwegian Government or the appropriate agency designated by it.

3. The Government of the United States of America recognizes that the Norwegian Merchant Fleet not only constitutes an important contribution to the war effort of the United Nations but is likewise one of the principal national assets of the Royal Norwegian Government and, accordingly, that the latter Government which is operating its Fleet for the benefit of the United Nations in the common war effort, should be assisted in replacing ships lost in the service of the United Nations. Accordingly, the Government of the United States of America will continue to review the situation with the Royal Norwegian Government with a view to assisting that Government in a program of replacement as soon as conditions permit. The two Governments agree that negotiations to this end should be commenced without delay and should be pressed to a conclusion as promptly as possible.

4. In the application of Article V of the Agreement relating to the return at the end of the present emergency of articles transferred under the Agreement, the Government of the United States of America will take into account the circumstance that when the invader has been driven from Norway it will be necessary for the Royal Norwegian Gov-

ernment to ensure the maintenance of re-established peaceful conditions. Accordingly, the Government of the United States of America and the Royal Norwegian Government will consider, and will consult with each other with respect to the possible retention by the latter of such military equipment as may be considered necessary for those purposes.

D. S. Bul, VI, p. 612-13.

***Government Statement of Peace Aims, London, July 21, 1942*¹**

... the abandonment of the pre-war project of a Nordic defensive bloc (consisting of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland), attachment to Norway's Atlantic allies, Britain and the U.S.A., and the establishment of a revived and greater League of Nations, with Norway acting as a "bridge between the Atlantic powers and the Soviet Union."

B.I.N., 1942, XIX, p. 721.

Johan Nygaardsvold, Prime Minister: Speech, London, December 1942

Hard battles and great difficulties may still be before us, but we are fighting together with all the other United Nations for freedom, independence and democracy. We fight for right and justice among individuals and nations, and we are fighting to assure an arrangement, after this war, which will create peace and common happiness all over the world. . . . But we do not look forward only to the victory and to the settling of old accounts. We also look forward to work and more work. We know that much work will have to be done after Norway has again become a free and independent country. It is to be built up anew, that which treason and German barbarism have violated or laid waste. Norway's independence and indivisibility must be made as safe and as sure as it is humanly possible to make them. There must be immediate relief for all wants and distress. The emptied warehouses must again be filled. Worn-out and destroyed means of production must be replaced, and fair compensation must be arranged, in justifiable manner, for those who have suffered unduly. There will be plenty of problems to work with before Norway can again become what it was before the Germans attacked.

Besides trying to organize all forces and to use all necessary means for the liberation of Norway, the Government has sought and will continue to seek to prepare those matters which I have mentioned above as

¹ See also article by Arne Ording, "Norway's Foreign Policy in the War and the Future" in *News of Norway*, II, 26, 1942, p. 103.

well as many others which we know will become acute when Norway is again a free country.

The present Government does not do this with any thought that it is to retain the power and look after the administration of Norway after the liberation. This Government has taken it for granted that the Norwegian people will, in a constitutional and democratic way, decide which lines of progress are to be followed and who is to exercise the administrative authority.

When the present Government applies itself to these post-war matters, it does so because it feels it a duty to see to it that various supplies, for example, will be available the moment there is need for them. Also that law and justice shall be followed and maintained during a difficult transition period, and that plans and courses of action shall be ready when Norway is set free. It will then be up to the Norwegian people to decide what things are to be done and who is to do the leading. . . .

News of Norway, II, p. 196-7.

Johan Nygaardsvold, Prime Minister: Christmas Broadcast to the People of Norway, London, December 1942

. . . Germany, and thus the individual German soldier, attacked, plundered and terrorized Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Yugoslavia, Greece, France, Denmark and Norway. All the people of Germany, and particularly the soldiers of Germany, are therefore co-responsible for the crimes that have been committed in the countries occupied by Germany. What the results of this responsibility will be for those guilty, I cannot say. All of the United Nations will, after the victory has been won, take hold of these questions. There is a strong possibility that when the final settlement is reached there will be many Germans who will wish that during the years immediately preceding the war they had received more butter and fewer cannon.

However, the Norwegian people reserve the right to deal with one group of war criminals by themselves. These are the Norwegian traitors, the quislings, those who belong to Nasjonal Samling. They will all have to stand trial in Norwegian courts for their crime against Norway, against the Norwegian laws and against the Norwegian people. All of them are known, and not one of them will escape answering for his acts, no matter whether these were of direct or indirect nature. The crimes of these traitors, as well as the punishment due them, may be of varying degrees, but all this will be taken care of by Norwegian penal laws which provide for varying degrees of punishment.

News of Norway, II, p. 196.

4. LUXEMBURG

Luxemburg is a duchy which was politically independent but closely linked economically to Belgium. Its total area was about 1,000 square miles. The present Grand Duchess, Charlotte, succeeded her sister on January 9, 1919. At the outbreak of war, a Coalition Cabinet was in office composed of Right and Socialist parties which had been appointed November 1937. On August 29, 1939, full executive and legislative powers were given to the Grand Duchess and her Government for the duration of hostilities by the unanimous vote of the Parliament.

1940

- May 10 Luxemburg was invaded by the German Army and submitted without resistance. The Grand Duchess Charlotte and her Cabinet left for France. After the collapse of France, temporary headquarters were established in Portugal. The Government subsequently moved to London, and then to Montreal, Canada, both cities being official seats of the Government.
- Aug. 6 Financial agreement with the Belgian Congo. This was superseded by an agreement of June 15, 1941 with the Belgian Government.

1941

- Jun. 15 The Belgian Government agreed to advance sufficient funds for the operation of the Luxemburg Government.
- Dec. 10 Declared its solidarity with the American people and its participation in the moral offensive against Japan.

1942

- Jan. 13 Allied Declaration on punishment for war crimes (see p. 7).

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Peter Dupong, Prime Minister: Speech on Adopting the Resolution,¹ June 12, 1941

In the name of the Luxemburg Government I have the honor to make the following statement: the Luxemburg Government is happy to associate itself and its country fully in this pact of solidarity during war and of collaboration in time of peace which is being submitted today for the signature of the governments allied to Great Britain.

Strong in their rights but fully conscious of their material weakness, the Luxemburg Government is all the readier to pay its tribute to the war and peace aims defined in this draft Resolution. During the war we all fight together, strong and weak, until the victory of justice over the brutal force, represented by the German aggressor and their associates. After the war the cooperation of free peoples, great and small, will create in Europe and in the world a New Order of economic and social security. We welcome with special satisfaction the declaration that the signatories

¹ See section United Nations, p. 3-4.

of this Resolution will aim at the establishment of a regime of economic and social security. If this program is realized, the principal cause of internal frictions and of armed conflicts with other nations will disappear among the nations.

Economic and social security is, and will be, the foundation and rampart of those liberties which are the very essence and justification of democratic regimes.

The affirmation that this is our common aim after the war shows clearly the line dividing the free regimes represented by the Governments united here today, from the regimes of oppression.

Economic and social liberty has no place in a dictatorial regime, because such a regime cannot desire or grant spiritual liberty. It was necessary to emphasize this aspect of our common struggle. It is the hope of the masses, and for that reason a powerful stimulant which encourages them to agree to the ever-growing sacrifices for our final victory.

The Luxemburg Government and people will bring to the realization of these aims their full cooperation in so far as their modest means permit. . . .

U. K., Cmd. 6285, Misc. No. 1 (1941), p. 10-11;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 5, p. 3.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, at St. James's Palace, London. Joseph Bech, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Speech on Adopting the First Resolution (Atlantic Charter), September 24, 1941*¹

In the name of the Luxemburg Government I give thankful adherence to the declaration on the common principles of a peace settlement, which the Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill, and President Roosevelt have given to the world.

In that remote Atlantic bay the two illustrious leaders of democracy have set alight a beacon of hope and guidance through the dark days brought upon the world by German fraud and force.

Today the whole world knows that the great English-speaking democracies are jointly pledged to the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, with the assurance of a better world built to the standards laid down in the Atlantic charter.

To the oppressed peoples the Declaration has brought renewed encouragement in their resistance; to all peoples a cause worth every sacrifice.

¹ See section United Nations, p. 3.

Would it be pretentious for me to underline the unselfishness of this cause by reference to my own country?

At the very moment that the Germans have abolished Luxemburg's independence and are persecuting our loyal people for their stubborn resistance, the historic rights of Europe's smallest democracy, whose material contribution to victory is perforce very limited, here find disinterested recognition in the principle that right must prevail against might.

Someone, referring to what remained unsaid in the joint declaration, has compared it to an Atlantic iceberg, of which the bulk remains submerged.

Truly, the Declaration is supported by the immense underlying strength of the spiritual and moral values upon which our civilization is founded against which Hitler's inhuman regime cannot prevail.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 11-12;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 5.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London, Joseph Bech, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Speech on Adopting the Second Resolution (Post-war Economic Needs of Europe), September 24, 1941

The Luxemburg Government thankfully agrees to the principles here submitted by His Majesty's Government and will be pleased to collaborate and submit to the central bureau and the Inter-Allied Committee estimates of the economic needs of Luxemburg. I welcome the spirit underlying the proposed measures. It is only in this spirit of close international economic collaboration that the post-war recovery of a convalescent Europe will be realized.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 26;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 9.

Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, January 13, 1942

[For text see United Nations, p. 7.]

Joseph Bech, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Address before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, Washington, June 3, 1942

... In spite of the necessarily limited scope of its present military contribution to the common cause, Luxemburg is recognized as an ally in the common struggle by the powers at war with the Axis, with all

rights and duties that this implies. It follows naturally that Luxemburg considers itself in a state of war with Germany, Italy, and Japan.

The very fact of the recognition, as an ally, of the smallest country in Europe, at a time when the Reich declares that the country has ceased to exist, is a pledge for the re-establishment of the independence of the grand duchy, and symbolic of the high aspirations and disinterested aims of the great democracies.

But in the Europe of tomorrow after the defeat of Germany, will small countries like Luxemburg have the right to live?

It may interest you to know the point of view of the representative of the smallest of allied countries on these questions — of a country which is in no way prepared to renounce its right to live after this war.

The official Allied answer is of course laid down in the Atlantic charter in general terms.

As to the right of existence of small countries, I cannot do better than quote the words of President Roosevelt: "We believe that any nationality, no matter how small, has the inherent right to its own nationhood."

These words of President Roosevelt and other similar expressions of Mr. Churchill form the backbone of the resistance of the small subjugated peoples on the Continent.

Unofficially there are some who claim that even in a new world based on the rule of right, international policies will continue to be a game of power, and that small, weak, defenseless nations would continue in the world to be a menace to themselves as well as to others. They must not continue to be a temptation for potential aggressors. In other words, the price to be paid for stabilized peace in a new Europe is the disappearance of the small nations.

It would certainly be a strange new world for which we are fighting, where the eventual victims of the beasts of prey must be sacrificed to prevent their being devoured.

For my country, as for other small countries, what matters is not so much the question of being devoured by this or that particular animal, but not being devoured at all. Would it not be more logical and more acceptable from a moral point of view, and also more efficient, to draw the beast's fangs?

The condition *sine qua non* of an assured European peace is the complete, controlled, and permanent disarmament of Germany. I have heard it said that this is impossible. But it is possible. It would have been possible after the last war if the will to do it had been there. I can tell you one thing, and that is: You may be sure that at this very moment

Germany has already prepared her plans to disarm the whole world in the event of her being victorious.

Let us never forget the fact that even a disarmed Germany of some 70,000,000 inhabitants will always be a greater menace to Europe than the so-called small nations. I say deliberately the so-called small nations. Indeed, what standards are we to apply to judge a nation small and defenseless in this blitzkrieg era, when nations which believed themselves strong and sufficiently armed were unable to resist the surprise attack of an aggressor, to whom no principle, no law is sacred? Was Poland a small country? Was France a defenseless, small country? And who would dare to say, with the knowledge we now possess, that France's collapse was caused by the fact that between her and Germany there were Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg — three small, neutral countries?

Is it not evident at this moment of the war that the Axis Powers had prepared their attack for many years — not to swallow small tempting morsels surrounding them, but to conquer empires and to achieve world domination?

The true fact is that each one of the free and peace-loving countries, whether strong or weak, now fighting the Axis Powers had at one time or another during the period since the Manchukuo affair remained neutral in the face of flagrant aggression against another country.

Rather is it the lack of solidarity between the defenders of peace — a solidarity operating automatically in the face of aggression and to the exclusion of all neutrality — which is the cause of our present troubles, than the existence of small countries. The League of Nations, which should have organized this solidarity, this collective security, did not succeed. The causes of this failure are manifold, the chief being that the Member States of the League were no able to approach the vital problems which the League had to solve, from a supernational point of view. . . .

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 167.

5. THE NETHERLANDS

The Netherlands is a constitutional monarchy. Under the constitution the executive power belongs exclusively to the Sovereign, while legislative power belongs to the Sovereign and Parliament jointly. The present Queen, Wilhelmina, succeeded to the throne on November 23, 1890, and was crowned September 6, 1898. On August 9, 1939, a Coalition Cabinet was formed including the Roman Catholic, Christian Historical, Social Democratic Labor and Liberal Democratic parties. The Premier belongs to the Anti-Revolutionary Party. The general administration and executive authority of the Netherlands East

506 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Indies rested in the hands of a Governor General assisted by an Advisory Council, the "Raad van Indie." On November 7, 1939, Queen Wilhelmina and King Leopold of Belgium issued a peace appeal to the belligerents.¹

1940

- May 10 Invasion by the German army.
" 13 Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands and members of the Cabinet left the country, transferring the seat of the Netherlands Government to London. All the territories of the Kingdom outside Europe are ruled by Royal Decree.
" 15 Capitulation of the Dutch army. According to a Royal Decree of May 24, 1940, the German-controlled territory of the Kingdom in Europe is considered enemy territory until the occupation ends.

1941

- Jul. 28 Agreement suspended whereby Japan was supplied with oil from the Indies.
Nov. 24 Agreement with the United States under which the latter sent troops to protect the bauxite mines in Surinam (Dutch Guiana) and with Brazil for cooperation in the defense of Surinam.
Dec. 8 Declaration of war on Japan.
" 11 Declaration of war on Italy.

1942

- Jan. 13 Allied Declaration on punishment for war crimes (see p. 7).
Feb. 11 Announcement of agreement with Venezuela regarding defense of Surinam.
Mar. 4 Government of the East Indies moved from Batavia to Bandoeng.
" 8 Fall of Bandoeng marked the loss of the Indies to the Allied cause.
" 9 The Governor General, Dr. Hubertus J. van Mook, and the Government moved to Australia.
May 5 Agreement with the United Kingdom regularizing the position of the Netherlands military forces in that territory.
Jun. 18 Queen Wilhelmina arrived in Ottawa, and subsequently visited the United States.
Jul. 8 Mutual Aid Agreement with the United States (see p. 513).
" 10 Agreement establishing diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. signed in London.

*Queen Wilhelmina: Broadcast to Her People, London, May 13, 1940*²

Today we have to admit that no happiness can be expected in this world if those who are solely responsible for the present situation are not definitely checked in their course of unscrupulous destruction and utter disregard for law and most of the elementary principles of morality.

After a heroic struggle in which my nation has attempted in every way to maintain peace it is being overpowered by sheer superiority of force.

¹ For text see *B.I.N.*, 1939, XVI, p. 1284.

² See also the Queen's proclamation to her people, issued in London, May 13, 1940 and her message to the world giving her reasons for leaving Holland (for texts see E. N. Kleffens, *Juggernaut over Holland*, p. 158-64).

But morally we can never be conquered. Our spirit will remain unbroken because our conscience is clear.

I pray to God that our Allied cause will be blessed and that the dawn of the day when freedom will be restored to the Netherlands and all other victims of German aggression is near.

Text from the Netherlands Information Bureau, New York.

Queen Wilhelmina: Broadcast to Holland and the Netherlands Empire, London, July 28, 1940

What is at stake in this war is the liberty of those all the world over who wish to work for the good of mankind, and to do so without being frustrated by the evildoers. Those who think that the spiritual value acquired through the ages can be destroyed with the sword must learn to realize the idleness of such beliefs. They must be made to understand that crude violence cannot deprive a people of its conviction. Just as in earlier days neither force of arms, nor the flames of the stake, nor impoverishment and suffering have ever succeeded in exterminating our love of liberty, our freedom of conscience and religion, so I remain convinced that once again we, and all those of whatever nation who think like us, shall emerge from this ordeal strengthened and chastened through our sacred sufferings. . . .

Even though the enemy has occupied our native soil, the Netherlands will carry on the war till the morrow of a free and happy future dawns for us. . . .

With unshakable unity we intend to vindicate our freedom, our independence and all our territories.

I call on my compatriots at home and wherever they may be, however dark and difficult the times may be, to keep faith in the final victory of our cause, which is strong, not only because it is served by strength in battle, but also because of the profound belief that our most sacred values are at stake.

The Times, July 29, 1940, p. 2.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Pieter S. Gerbrandy, Prime Minister: Speech on Adoption of the Resolution, June 12, 1941

. . . The purpose of this meeting is to impress upon the whole world, not least on the enemy, the determination of us, the Allies, to continue our common struggle until victory is won. What I have to communicate to all of you, therefore, is the unshakable determination of the Netherlands nation and Government to carry on until the objects mentioned in

the draft resolution now before us have been attained; a draft resolution containing not contracted obligations but a real leading principle

We shall do all *we* can. We know *you* will do all *you* can. We rejoice to see the United States of America, under the tried leadership of Mr. Roosevelt, are helping our cause, which in its essence is also the cause of the Americans in ever-increasing measure.

There may be some indications that the Axis Powers have already passed their zenith; nevertheless we do not know if the development of the terrible world crisis we are facing just now has already reached its culmination point. But, whatever the right diagnosis of the moment, our confidence remains firm, for our confidence, however heart-rending the conditions of our people in Europe may be, does not depend on the duration but, first of all, relates more to the character of this struggle to the death.

To prevent Hitler from spreading spiritual and political death over the countries of the world is not alone a matter of passing opportunity, but, above all, an everlasting duty.

Our confidence, therefore, rests in the last instance in the *source* of this duty to defend a righteous cause, of which source Hitler will discover that it is in reality the Lord and Divine Master who decides upon the destiny even of the German people.

The paradox is that this basis offers, albeit not to the Nazis, to the German people the opportunity of obtaining their share in the common prosperity, freedom and happiness which it is our duty to establish, provided always that the German people break with their desire to obtain more than their own share of political life in the society of free peoples.

We recognize in Winston Churchill's statesmanship the uncompromising lead we need against this German tyranny.

Allow me to stress the necessity of organizing the common effort of the subjugated peoples to break the artificial Continental State structure of Hitler from within with the same energy as we are trying to break it down from outside on sea, on land, and in the air.

U. K., Cmd. 6285, Misc. No. 1 (1941), p. 8-9;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 5, p. 4.

Queen Wilhelmina: Broadcast regarding the Invasion of the Soviet Union by Germany, June 24, 1941

. . . I would like to say a few words with regard to the new war picture that shows itself, a result of the sudden and traitorous attack of Hitler's armies on the people of Russia. . . .

When a similar thing befell us, we joined the group of nations that had prepared themselves for the defense, or recovery, of their liberty. Shoulder to shoulder with those nations, we now fight with all the means at our disposal . . . for the maintenance and protection of what belongs to the highest goods of mankind. And here it is immaterial where the usurper or his allies threaten or attack those goods, or who is to be the victim of such attacks. Our battle is against the satanic principles and abhorrent practices of Nazidom.

Today it is Russia, but we know tomorrow or the day after tomorrow, it will be the mighty bulwarks of our civilization and the principles that are holy to us — the British Empire and the United States of America — that will have to withstand the onslaught of Hitler's war machine. It is, therefore, that we, whenever the circumstances will necessitate it, will also fight next to the people of Soviet Russia. This we will do, remaining faithful to the viewpoint we had — as a result of our principles — taken with regard to Bolshevism. And may we never forget to reject completely the dogmas and practice of Bolshevism.

Yes, even stronger than before, we wish to be ourselves and remain thus, with God's help, until the farthest future. . . .

Release from the Netherlands Information Bureau, New York.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. E. N. van Kleffens, Foreign Minister: Speech on Adoption of the First Resolution (Atlantic Charter), September 24, 1941*¹

On behalf of the Netherlands Government I am happy to express adhesion to the declaration of principles which seems destined to be known in history as the Atlantic Charter.

We give our adhesion because it is our conviction that the principles underlying the Charter, if properly applied, will go far to advance that better international order which is to bring to all countries international and national security and prosperity. We thank the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of His Britannic Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom for having taken this auspicious initiative.

I should like to add a statement, asking that it be put on record, on one specific point; the fourth of the joint British-American declaration, which says that the United States and the United Kingdom "will

¹ See section United Nations, p. 3.

endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

The words "with due respect for their existing obligations" appear to be in the nature of a reservation, and in their strictly legal sense these words seem natural enough. But it seems to us equally natural that, if the object expressed in this fourth point of the declaration is to be achieved, such existing obligations should not be perpetuated, even as exceptions, when it is clear that their continued operation would seriously impair or diminish the beneficial effect which is to accrue to all from the application of the general rule. In our present world, which is only the morrow of yesterday's world with its nefarious autarchic tendencies, the very opposite of the spirit expressed in the Atlantic Charter, we shall all have to do away, to some considerable extent, with measures designed to protect existing economic units. This will mean sacrifices for all, though these sacrifices will be worth the price if, as we confidently anticipate, greater national and international stability and greater prosperity is the result. Since in the economic field protection engenders protection, there should not be left in being, in our opinion, important exceptions to the general rule of free access to trade and raw materials on the basis of equal opportunities for all. Otherwise this fine principle, to which the Netherlands which has always stood for freedom of commerce professes full adhesion, would degenerate into a fine phrase. It does not seem to us out of place to state this explicitly: at the end of the last war, the same principle found solemn expression in almost identical terms, and we all know what became of it when the snowball of protection was set rolling until it became so large that it was a serious obstacle in the path of international trade.

My Government therefore takes the reservation in point 4 to mean that, just as no existing obligation is invalidated by that point *ipso facto*, so no such obligation is thereby to be perpetuated. Further I should like to place on record the view of my Government that the highly important aims enunciated in point 4 of the declaration cannot be attained if considerable exceptions thereto are left in being. For that reason we express the earnest hope that, desirous as we are to see trade barriers removed and discriminatory treatment in international commerce abolished, a serious common effort be made to that end for the ultimate benefit of all.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 12-13;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 5.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. E. N. van Kleffens, Foreign Minister: Speech on Adoption of the Second Resolution (Post-war Economic Needs of Europe), September 24, 1941*¹

The Netherlands Government gladly adopts the resolution on the understanding that nothing therein will be deemed to preclude them from carrying out, under their own responsibility, the arrangements made by them for provisional relief of the Netherlands at the end of hostilities.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 26;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 9-10.

Declaration of the Netherlands Government to the People's Council, Netherlands East Indies, Batavia, November 13, 1941

The 28 native members of the Volksraad (People's Council) of the Netherlands East Indies on August 26 asked the Netherlands Government in London to explain the consequences of the Atlantic Charter for the Indonesian population. The reply was this declaration to the Volksraad, which is the representative advisory body of the Governor General.

The Netherlands Government at the recent Inter-Allied Conference in London approved the Atlantic Charter, thereby expressing confidence that the Charter's principles — if duly executed — will promote a better international order which can bring to all countries national and international security and prosperity.

The Charter lays down general rules of conduct for the establishment of good international relationships. Although it does not concern itself directly with the internal relations in the individual states, every Government accepting the Charter should also be willing to accept the principles as far as rules of conduct inside the State are concerned.

As these principles were already adopted long ago by the Netherlands Government and, as far as appropriate thereto, executed within the Kingdom, adherence to the Charter does not represent a special reason for new consideration regarding the aims of its policy, more especially as far as the Indonesian population is concerned.

It may be considered as generally known how much the Netherlands Government pursues a policy of ordered, free collaboration for all groups of the population and interests within the Kingdom, and how, through practical statesmanship, it tries to bring about the quickest possible development toward this aim.

¹ See section United Nations, p. 4.

A post-war investigation of constitutional relations, for which purpose a conference of prominent persons from all parts of the Kingdom is to be held, will give the Government, as well as those governed, an opportunity to form a clear idea of the stage of development which has been reached, and to plan reforms.

Emerson, R., *The Netherlands Indies and the United States*, Boston, World Peace Foundation, 1942, p. 89-90.

*Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, London, January 13, 1942*¹

[For text see United Nations, p. 7.]

Statement of the Netherlands Government Announcing the Calling of a Post-War Reconstruction Conference Composed of Representatives from All Parts of the Kingdom, London, January 27, 1942

The present political structure of the Kingdom of the Netherlands as well as the relations between the Motherland and her Overseas Territories are based on the Constitution of 1922 and the Constitutions of the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao, built thereon.

Since 1922 the spiritual and material development of these Overseas Territories, especially the Netherlands Indies, has been unusually rapid. In consequence, the thoughts of the Motherland and the Indies, in and outside their representative bodies, during the latter years have been especially focused on constitutional measures for a greater emancipation within the Empire of these Overseas Territories.

The excellent attitude and spiritual energy that these parts displayed under the leadership of their Governors and notwithstanding the rupture of their ties with the Motherland, proofs given in these times of their ability to stand on their own legs, have stimulated the processes of spiritual and political emancipation in ever-growing groups of overseas populations.

In order to direct these deserving aspirations, aiming at the improvement of relationships between Netherlands territories in accordance with gradually developing circumstances, Her Majesty Queen Wilhelmina announced in a radio speech on May 10, 1941 that an Imperial Conference would be convened after the war.

The Crown now has made its decision in regard to calling this post-war conference in order to prepare the way for carrying through political reforms. The conference will be composed of prominent persons from

¹ See statement by Eelco N. van Kleffens, Minister for Foreign Affairs, in *La France Libre*, London, November 1941.

all the four Netherlands territories who will be expected to represent various spiritual movements in these parts.

Participation will be as follows: from the Netherlands, 15 members; Netherlands Indies, 15 members; and Surinam and Curaçao each three. Of the 15 members from the Netherlands Indies, 10 will be appointed by the Government of the Netherlands Indies on recommendation of the People's Council and five by the Government of the Netherlands Indies independently. Members from Surinam and Curaçao will be appointed by the Governor, two on recommendation of the States and one of the Government.

Appointment of the members for the East and West Indies will be made now in order to enable the appointees to study and prepare their subject freely and thoroughly. The Governor-General of the Netherlands Indies and the Governors of Surinam and Curaçao have been asked to publish the Queen's decision with all possible speed and to appoint deputies for their territories.

The conference's task will be of an advisory nature and the conference itself will be in the nature of a round-table discussion which will consider all wishes and opinions in regard to the position of the various territories within the structure of the Empire and will make recommendations on the basis of these discussions.

The Queen Looks at the Future, The Netherlands Information Bureau, New York.

Mutual Aid Agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, July 8, 1942

[For master agreement see section United Nations, p. 10;
for text see *D. S. Bul.*, VI, p. 604-6]

Dr. A. Loudon, Ambassador to the United States: Letter to Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, July 8, 1942

In connection with the signature on this date of the Agreement between our two Governments on the Principles Applying to Mutual Aid in the Prosecution of the War Against Aggression I have the honor to confirm our understanding that this Agreement replaces and renders inoperative, as from today, the prior Agreement between our two Governments on the same subject, dated August 9, 1941.

I have the honor also to confirm our understanding that the signature of this Agreement does not affect in any way the arrangements now being made through the Office of Lend-Lease Administration for the

transfer to various agencies of the United States Government for certain aircraft, munitions, military property and procurement contracts of the Royal Netherlands Government in the United States, and for the reimbursements to be made to the Royal Netherlands Government in that connection.

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 606.

Queen Wilhelmina: Speech before the Congress of the United States, Washington, August 6, 1942

. . . Those of us who have the inestimable privilege of being free feel that it is our holy duty toward our enslaved compatriots in East and West to do whatever we can to hasten the day of victory.

Democracy is our most precious heritage.

We cannot breathe in the sullen atmosphere of despotic rule.

The people of the Netherlands have developed their free institutions in their own progressive way, in accordance with their high regard for personal and national liberty.

They had long approached the complete realization of the Four Freedoms which the President of the United States has set as one of the aims of our common war effort. There was of old in our whole Kingdom freedom of religion and of speech; there also was freedom from fear, and constant forward steps, designed to insure freedom from want, were in ever-expanding evolution.

Throughout my reign the development of democracy and progress in the Netherlands Indies has been our constant policy.¹

Under Netherlands stewardship a great number of peoples and tribes are being systematically merged into one harmonious community, in which all these elements: the Indonesians in their rich variety of religions, languages, arts and customary laws, the Chinese, the Arabs and the Westerners feel equally at home.

Careful consideration has constantly been given to the particular characteristics and needs of the peoples concerned.

Confronted as we found ourselves by highly developed forms of civilization to which the population is deeply attached, we strove not to uproot these, but to promote their adaptation to the exigencies of the modern world.

The voluntary cooperation in mutual respect and toleration between people of Oriental and Western stock toward full partnership in government on a basis of equality has been proved possible and successful.

¹ See article by Eelco N. van Kleffens, "The Democratic Future of the Netherlands Indies," in *Foreign Affairs*, October 1942, vol. 21, p. 88-102.

Increasing self-government, keeping pace with the rapidly broadening enlightenment and education of the native population, has been enacted ever since the beginning of this century and especially since the revision of the constitution in 1925.

This steady and progressive development received new emphasis and momentum by my announcement last year that after the war the place of the overseas territories in the framework of the Kingdom and the constitution of those territories will be the subject of a conference in which all parts of the kingdom are to be fully represented.

Consultations on this subject were already proceeding in the Netherlands Indies when the Japanese invasion temporarily interrupted their promising course.

The preparation of the conference is none the less being actively continued, but in accordance with sound democratic principle no final decision will be taken without the cooperation of the people once they are free again.

What are our war aims, and what our peace aims?

We have adhered to the Atlantic Charter and our lend-lease agreement with the United States points the way to wise international economic planning.

We want nothing that does not belong to us.

We want to resume our place as an independent nation on the fringe of the Atlantic, on the dividing line of the Pacific and the Indian Ocean and to remain your good neighbor in the Caribbean Sea, and we accept the responsibilities resulting from that situation.

And above all, we want to see suitable measures taken in order that henceforth no nation may think it can, with impunity, break its pledged word or attack others.

When speaking of war and peace aims, I do not forget, were it only for one brief moment, that first of all there is a war to be won.

In that war we are with you and the other United Nations to the last. . . .

United we stand, and united we will achieve victory.

Cong. Rec., vol. 88, p. 6965; *Vital Speeches*, 1942, VIII, p. 661-2.

Pieter S. Gerbrandy, Prime Minister: Speech at London, August 15, 1942

It is outside the power of the Netherlands Government in London to take reprisals immediately for the murder of the innocent patriots but the Netherlands Government takes its stand on the basis of justice because they wage a war for justice.

In the occupied territory power and justice are separated for the moment as far as the Netherlands Government is concerned. But, compatriots, this will not remain so. The moment comes when the Netherlands Government on its own territory will have the power to apply justice, in other words, to try those who have committed common crimes and war crimes, and those who have been accomplices.

The Netherlands Government is obliged by law, among others under the international agreement concluded in London on January 1, 1942, to assist in the trial of war criminals so that the guilty will be unable to evade punishment.

The Netherlands Government's power, at present reunited with law, will be used for carrying out the obligations which now already rest on them, which will rest on them in the future, also when the extreme penalty measures are demanded.

At present the Government will use the power in no less degree for applying national law. The murder of the innocent is a practice of the German occupier together with the disloyal Netherlands. The trial, with the application of punishment including the death penalty, remains the aim and duty of the Netherlands Government. The trial will be public and speedy.

Netherlands Information Office, New York.

Hubertus J. van Mook, Colonial Minister: Speech at London, October 5, 1942

Under these circumstances — assuming that collaboration between the Dutch and Indonesians remains — the case of the Netherlands East Indies seems comparatively simple. We could reconstitute an effective system for controlling foreign exchange at all international price levels which were established before the Indies were overrun.

The country provides many of life's prime necessities in sufficient quantities and, although production has been heavily damaged by war — through the "scorched earth" policy and the depredations of the enemy — agricultural production sources will still exist after the war. In many cases such production can be resumed by simple means with a limited outlay of new capital.

If Indies products can obtain access to world markets at fair and reasonable prices it may well be the Netherlands East Indies will not want very extensive or very long-term credits in order to get started on the way to reconstruction.

You will forgive me if I say that when people speak about free access to raw materials we are inclined to listen with tongue in cheek. Our

experience in past decades has been that access to markets on fair and equal terms was a more pressing problem.

Probably we know more concerning the effects of tariffs and quota preferences on exports than most other countries. Having been party to some of the most reasonable and successful regulation schemes, for the initiation of which we were beholden to our British friends, we are certain that it is possible to achieve a more stable export system in the future which will protect at the same time the producer and the consumer.

Hence, under a number of not too favorable circumstances after the war, the Netherlands East Indies will stand in need of many industrial products, and they will be able within a comparatively short time to pay their way as they go along. They will be equally eager to sell or to buy

In considering export possibilities from the British Empire to the Indies the parties concerned from the beginning must take the most dynamic point of view. If during and before the reconstruction period the need for replacing destruction is prevailing and the Indies thus buy — although it may be in greater quantities — the same goods they bought before the development of secondary and perhaps even of some primary industries, the adaptation of the country to its needs and potentialities will inevitably, nevertheless, follow.

Netherlands Information Office, New York.

***Queen Wilhelmina: Message to the New York Herald Tribune Forum,
Delivered by H. J. van Mook, Minister for the Netherlands Indies,
Surinam and Curaçao, New York, November 17, 1942***

... I believe that there is general agreement on the need of the United Nations being ready for the moment when hostilities cease. It is quite true, of course, that first the war has to be won and that the best brains and stoutest hearts devote themselves to that primary task. Without final victory, planning for peace is useless, worse than useless, because it is apt to create the fatal illusion that winning the war will take care of itself — which it obviously will not

But without forgetting that for a single moment, we also have to remember that if we do not thrust our mind and our will in time on the problems of peace, those problems will suddenly thrust themselves on us. Chaos would be the result and the beaten enemy would not be slow in taking advantage of it. I believe that this is more and more being realized and that governments and peoples generally are acting accordingly.

It would not be enough if only the governments took these important matters in hand. A well-informed public opinion is indispensable. The free press has a most important duty in this respect. We see here the merit and advantage that the truly democratic countries have over our enemies. *We* have the benefit of the interstimulation between the authorities and people, resulting in real, voluntary support for government action. *They* have to be content with decisions molded by a few. Consequently there is every chance, as soon as things go wrong, that the people will disassociate themselves from their supposedly omniscient leaders.

It seems to me worth while summarizing briefly what consensus there exists between and among the United Nations on matters of peace and what are the chief problems that will have to be dealt with.

The Axis countries want to destroy human liberty for individual persons as well as for individual nations. Their aim is retrograde in the sense that they want to bring back the old, old form of domination which our ancestors successfully toiled to eliminate — tyranny.

We, on the other hand, want to uphold human liberty and establish a happy balance between the rights and duties of the individual and those of the community. Within each state we want to safeguard the citizen from undue interference by the authorities and, conversely, we want to enable the authorities to fulfill their task, too, caused by the excessive assertion of individual rights. And in the family of nations we want to pursue the same ideal.

Our aim, in a word, is the golden mean between private rights and the needs of the community. That is the very opposite of the retrograde — it is a perpetual process of adjustment as new conditions arise, a forward, progressive movement.

Nowhere had this deep conviction of us all been more strikingly applied than in the Netherlands Indies since the beginning of the century. In that island community, old government forms had become obsolete. A happy parallelism existed between the aspirations of the native intelligentsia and my compatriots from Holland. Both wanted progressive emancipation of the gifted races living there. It is for that reason that, despite the inertia of tradition, which is so strong in the masses of the East, and despite also the very great ethnographic, linguistic and many other diversities and difficulties, a bi-political unit is being gradually formed there on a basis of cooperation between the Asiatic element and the European element from Holland, under the voluntarily-accepted aegis of the Netherlands Kingdom, of which the Indies are not colonies but a component part — just as the Netherlands in Europe. This

process is, as you know, being continued. No opportunity for advancing it is allowed to slip by.

Specific aims were set for the United Nations when your President formulated the Four Freedoms which we seek to attain — Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Expression, Freedom of Worship and Freedom from Fear and Want. We could all the more readily associate ourselves with these aims since, as I said in my address to Congress last summer, the Netherlands people had long approached — and to a large extent attained — the realization of these Four Freedoms. Nothing illustrates better the retrograde trend of the Axis policies than the fact that the German and Japanese occupation of Netherlands territory meant the end, for the time being, of each and all of the Four Freedoms on our soil. . . .

Further amplification was given to our stated common purpose by the adoption of the Atlantic Charter by all the United Nations. I do not need to recall to your minds the tenets of that charter, which has its place in perpetuity, in the history of personal and national rights and duties. It will be its application which will matter as much as its enunciation and acceptance. Not all of its clauses are equally clear. When it is interpreted in terms of practical measures it will be important to remember that it is an instrument for good. With that touchstone we should never go far wrong.

So much for our fundamental convictions and aims

I should like to add a few words on our chief peace problems. It seems to me that they are twofold. On the one hand measures will have to be taken in each country to bring it back on a peace footing. The demobilization of the Armed Forces will raise many difficulties, especially in the social sphere. The same holds good in the economic field when it comes to readapting industry for peace needs and reviving commerce. In the occupied countries, where so much has been ravaged, pillaged, stolen and destroyed, the difficulties will be very great. International help will be indispensable to rescue those sorely-tried peoples. But many more of these problems will have to be dealt with nationally, and I can say no more about them for that reason.

On the other hand there are many problems which can only be dealt with on international lines. How are we to rebuild the world? How are we to assure international security? How are we to direct international trade? Much thought is being given to these problems in the press and by private agencies, as well as by governments.

You will, on this occasion, not expect many concrete suggestions. There are still too many unknown elements which only time will reveal

as being pertinent and relevant. But I should like to point out what to me seems to be a danger. I hear much about machinery which will have to be set up to ensure international security, to regulate exchanges, to direct the flow of goods and to raise the living standard throughout the world, especially in the countries hitherto less favored in that respect. But it seems to me that another problem, so far left very much in the dark, is at least as important and probably even more important. The problem is — What is going to be done with the beaten enemies? What with Germany? What with Japan? What with Italy and the lesser states aiding the Axis? If wise measures are not taken in this respect, the best edifice for international security and trade will be of little or no avail.

The thirst for revenge will be great and understandable. Let us not, however, allow revenge to be our guiding motive. Revenge is barren, except in that it breeds revenge. Let justice be our aim, justice and firmness tempered by wisdom. Impracticable or exorbitant measures are just as bad as no measures at all. That has not always been remembered. Let us not lose sight of it again. We must be just, firm, realistic and far-sighted. The future of those who come after us is at stake, and for that future we are to a large extent responsible.

The Netherlands Kingdom is situated in Europe, Asia and along the shore of the Caribbean. Our interests are bound up with the interests of other peaceful nations in those vast areas. Our rights there have their necessary corollaries in duties — duties to contribute as much as we can to the security of those regions and let them participate in the economic life of the world at large, to which their natural resources can make an indispensable contribution. You will, therefore, always find the Netherlands on the side of those who are willing to make a genuine contribution towards international safety from aggression, towards the freest possible flow of commerce, as a free and independent state imbued with a sincere spirit of cooperation. We hope that we may count upon the same spirit in the other nations.

Twice in a lifetime we have seen that international peace and prosperity are indivisible. Twice the lack of preparedness has made the waters rise to our very lips. Unless we are prepared to face realities the same waters might well engulf us if they are allowed to rise a third time. For you and for us, as well as for everybody, international cooperation is the only salvation — not only *in* this war but *after* it. Every person who shares this conviction must, I think, see to it that it prevails. Let us all, Americans and Dutch, work and strive to that end.

Netherlands News, V, p. 53-6.

Queen Wilhelmina: Radio Address, December 6, 1942

. . . In previous addresses I announced that it is my intention, after the liberation, to create the occasion for a joint consultation about the structure of the Kingdom and its parts, in order to adapt it to the changed circumstances.

The conference of the entire Kingdom which will be convoked for this purpose, has been further outlined in a Government declaration of January 27, 1942.¹ The preparation of this conference, in which prominent representatives of the three overseas parts of the Kingdom will be united with those of the Netherlands at a round table, had already been begun in the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao, the parts of the Kingdom which then still enjoyed their freedom.

Especially in the Netherlands Indies, detailed material had been collected for this purpose and it was transmitted to me in December 1941 by the Governor General. The battle of the Netherlands Indies disrupted these promising preparations.

We can only resume these preparations when everyone will be able to speak his mind freely.

Although it is beyond doubt that a political reconstruction of the Kingdom as a whole and of the Netherlands and the overseas territories as its parts is a natural evolution, it would be neither right nor possible to define its precise form at this moment.

I realize that much which is great and good is growing in the Netherlands despite the pressure of the occupation; I know that this is the case in the Indies where our unity is fortified by common suffering.

These developing ideas can only be shaped in free consultation in which both parts of the Kingdom will want to take cognizance of each other's opinions.

Moreover, the population of the Netherlands and of the Netherlands Indies has confirmed through its suffering and its resistance, its right to participate in the decision regarding the form of our responsibility as a nation towards the world and of the various groups of the population towards themselves and one another.

By working out these matters now, that right would be neglected, and the insight which my people have obtained through bitter experience would be disregarded.

I am convinced, and history as well as reports from the occupied territories confirm me in this, that after the war it will be possible to reconstruct the Kingdom on the solid foundation of complete partner-

¹ See p. 512.

ship, which will mean the consummation of all that has been developed in the past.

I know that no political unity or national cohesion can continue to exist which are not supported by the voluntary acceptance and the faith of the great majority of the citizenry.

I know that the Netherlands more than ever feel their responsibility for the vigorous growth of the Overseas Territories and that the Indonesians recognize, in the ever-increasing collaboration, the best guarantee for the recovery of their peace and happiness.

The war years have proved that both peoples possess the will and the ability for harmonious and voluntary cooperation.

A political unity which rests on this foundation moves far towards a realization of the purpose for which the United Nations are fighting, as it has been embodied, for instance, in the Atlantic Charter, and with which we could instantly agree, because it contains our own conception of freedom and justice for which we have sacrificed blood and possessions in the course of our history.

I visualize, without anticipating the recommendations of the future conference, that they will be directed towards a Commonwealth in which the Netherlands, Indonesia, Surinam and Curaçao will participate, with complete self-reliance and freedom of conduct for each part regarding its internal affairs, but with the readiness to render mutual assistance.

It is my opinion that such a combination of independence and collaboration can give the Kingdom and its parts the strength to carry fully their responsibility, both internally and externally.

This would leave no room for discrimination according to race or nationality; only the ability of the individual citizens and the needs of the various groups of the population will determine the policy of the government.

In the Indies, as in the Netherlands, there now rules an oppressor who, imitating his detestable associates and repudiating principles which he himself has recognized in the past, interns peaceful citizens and deprives women and children of their livelihood.

He has uprooted and dislocated that beautiful and tranquil country; his new order brings nothing but misery and want.

Nevertheless, we can aver that he has not succeeded in subjugating us, and as the ever-growing force of the United Nations advances upon him from every direction, we know that we will not succeed in the future.

The Netherlands Indies and the Netherlands with their fighting men on land, at sea and in the air, with their alert and brave merchantmen and by their dogged and never failing resistance in the hard struggle,

will see their self-sacrifice and intrepidity crowned, after the common victory, with the recovery of peace and happiness for their country and their people in a new world.

In that regained freedom they will be able to build a new and better future.

Netherlands News, V, p. 106.

6. BELGIUM

The Constitution of 1831 states that Belgium is a "constitutional representative . . . monarchy" and vests executive power in the King and Cabinet and legislative power in the King and the Parliament jointly. The present King, Leopold III, ascended the throne February 23, 1934. At the outbreak of war a National Union Cabinet was in office which had been appointed January 5, 1940. In external relations, a policy of strict neutrality had been adhered to since October 1936. On November 7, 1939, King Leopold and Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands issued a peace appeal to the belligerents.¹

1940

- May 10 Belgium invaded by German military forces.
- " 28 The Belgium army capitulated at Bruges. King Leopold unconditionally surrendered the Belgian Army, and since then has been a prisoner of war. The Cabinet, which had previously left the country, met in Paris and unanimously declared the capitulation illegal. In accordance with Art. 82 of the Constitution and the law of Sept. 7, 1931, it constituted itself the Belgian Government. The Government subsequently moved to Poitiers, then to Vichy. It declared that a state of war existed with Germany and Italy.
- Jun. 6 The British Government recognized the Belgian Government-in-Exile and declared that the Kingdom was regarded as territory under German occupation.
- " 18 Full executive and legislative powers for the Belgian colonial territories vested in the Minister for Colonies. After about six weeks in Portugal he proceeded to England where he was joined by the Minister of Finance with whom he proceeded to establish the Belgian Government in London.
- Oct. 22 The Prime Minister reached London, where a reorganized Cabinet took up its duties.
- Nov. 26 Governor-General of the Belgian Congo declared state of war with Italy.

1941

- Jan. 21 Purchase and finance agreements with the United Kingdom relating to the Belgian Congo.²
- " 25 A "juridical council" established to advise the Government on laws and decrees.
- Feb. 19 Three Under Secretaries of State appointed to be in charge of administrative services.
- Dec. 20 War declared against Japan.

¹ For text see *B.I.N.*, 1939, XVI, p. 1284.

² See U K , Treaty Series No. 1 (1941), Cmd. 6248 This agreement was renewed June 4, 1942; see Treaty Series No. 1 (1942), Cmd 6365.

1942

- Jan. 13 Allied Declaration on punishment for war crimes (see p. 7).
 Feb. 11 The *Conseil Consultatif du Gouvernement* made up of former senators and deputies and other leaders in exile was established to serve in an advisory capacity to the Government.
 Jun. 4 Military agreement with the United Kingdom.
 " 16 Mutual aid agreement with the United States (see p. 529)
 Nov. 12 Belgian Government notified the Chinese Government that it would give up its extraterritorial rights in China.

Hubert Pierlot, Prime Minister: Broadcast from London, October 1940

The Belgian Government is established in London with the Governments of the other free peoples whose territories are overrun by the Nazi armies.

. . . We shall fight to the end, with all the means that remain to us on land, sea and the air . . . Belgium's war aims can be stated in a very few words. We are making war because we want peace; not the peace of submission and shame, but peace with independence and honor.

Australia, *C.N.I.A.*, 1942, XIII, p. 32-3.

Camille Gutt, Minister of Finance: Broadcast, London, October 24, 1940

What is the aim of our Government? The liberation of Belgium and the liberation of our King, who is a prisoner of war; the restoration of our country's territorial integrity and of her independence.

The Times, October 25, 1940, p. 3.

***Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Hubert Pierlot, Prime Minister: Speech on Adoption of the Resolution, June 12, 1941*¹**

[Translation]

The Belgian Government readily associates itself with the declaration proposed by the British Government. We are glad to take this occasion to affirm our complete solidarity with the British Government, with the Dominion Governments and with the Governments of the free nations whose countries have been invaded by Germany. With them we have the firm intention of continuing the struggle with all the resources remaining to us and of fighting until the final victory. In saying this, I am certain I am speaking for the whole of Belgium, which amid all the sufferings arising out of enemy occupation maintains a strong spirit of resistance.

¹ See section United Nations, p. 3.

The British Foreign Secretary, in a recent talk, spoke of the spirit of resistance of the Belgian people grouped around their King and of the opposition of the Belgian people to all the efforts of the invader. These words had a deep echo in all Belgian hearts. Belgium knows that only victory will restore her independence and render possible her national revival. Belgium knows Great Britain. She also knows Germany. Great Britain is fighting once again for the principles of liberty and self-government, for a political tradition which arose almost simultaneously in Great Britain and in the old Low Countries, for whose maintenance my fellow-countrymen have fought so often in the course of their history. Between Great Britain and Belgium there is therefore not only a unity of aspirations, but also common interests which form one of the most constant features of Belgian foreign policy. British power has never been a source of danger to us. We see in its maintenance a safeguard for our country, both as regards the metropolis and our overseas possessions.

During the short space of one lifetime, Belgium has experienced two German invasions. Twice our dangerous and too powerful neighbor violated our frontier in contempt of its sworn word and has involved our country in ruin. Our constant thought is that our children should not experience a repetition of the same catastrophe for the third time.

Belgium can only be secure if the military and political power of Germany, and not only of the Nazi regime, is destroyed. The First Reich was responsible for the crime of 1914; the Second Reich prepared what it termed revenge; the Third repeated the crime. Is not such experience sufficient? It shows under different regimes the spirit of aggression which has always inspired German policy.

Against this danger it is essential to organize a real lasting system of guarantees. Without wishing to commit the future Governments of Belgium, I am certain that Belgium will contribute to the organization of any system of common security undertaken under the initiative of Great Britain. Belgium will undertake her share of necessary sacrifices as she did from the beginning of the last war, provided such guarantees are effective; her defensive efforts will only be limited by her available strength, provided that the powers exposed like herself to the same risks will also observe that vigilance whose necessity has been shown by experience. Between free peoples united action should be based upon reciprocal esteem. I am therefore very glad to have this opportunity to repeat once again the admiration felt by my fellow-countrymen for the courage which is being shown at this moment by the whole British nation, for the clarity of view and indomitable energy with which the

British Government and its leader is conducting this struggle for freedom and peace of the world

U.K., Cmd. 6285, Misc. No. 1 (1941), p. 9-10;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 5, p. 2.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Paul-Henri Spaak, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Speech on Adoption of the First Resolution (Atlantic Charter), September 24, 1941*¹

[Translation]

After our victory we shall have to defend ourselves against two types of adversaries: the sowers of illusions and the defeatists. The first class expect an ideal world to come out of this war. They will put before us magnificent plans and projects as grandiose as they will be unrealizable. The second class through egoism, idleness, or self-interest will just wish to return to the mistakes which have brought us to our present pass. We must have the strength and the will to avoid these dangers and to surmount these obstacles. . . .

The Belgian Government adheres without any reserve to this charter. The principles embodied in it are wise and constitute an ideal capable of realization. It shows very clearly the triple goal towards which we must aim, for which men hope, and which the peoples have a right to reach: political security, economic prosperity, social well-being. We should not seek in the Atlantic Charter for a solution to all the problems resulting from the peace, nor for a reply to all the different questions arising out of the present state of the world. To adhere completely to it as we are doing, it is enough that it sketches in a just way the main lines of our future action. . . .

U.K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 7-8;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 3.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Camille Gutt, Minister of Finance: Speech on Adoption of the Second Resolution (Post-war Economic Needs of Europe), September 24, 1941*²

[Translation]

The Belgian Government has learned with the greatest satisfaction of the proposed resolution. It readily adheres to that resolution. It thanks the Government of the United Kingdom for having taken the

¹ See section United Nations, p. 3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

initiative in placing this proposal before us. On the morrow of our victory, no problem will be so urgent or so important as the reprovisioning of the countries occupied, pillaged and oppressed by Germany. This problem will be complicated. It is therefore an act of wisdom to consider it at this stage. Furthermore, the Belgian Government warmly approve the proposed solution.

It sees in this solution the foundations of close collaboration between the Allied countries for a precise and constructive task. It has also gladly noted the interest taken in this question by the United States Government. It has decided to collaborate with all its strength in this task in the hope that this collaboration, which it regards as indispensable, can be extended more and more into other domains.

U K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 23;
I-A R, 1941, I, 9, p. 9.

Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, London, January 13, 1942

[For text see section United Nations, p. 7]

Hubert Pierlot, Prime Minister: Speech on Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, London, February 1, 1942

... No matter how severe the necessities of war may be, civilized nations have, nevertheless, recognized and proclaimed rules which every belligerent ought to obey, and also every man, friend or foe, who would bear arms so as to win for himself the title of soldier, and not that of bandit. I mean a respect for the life of a combattant who surrenders unconditionally, for the lives and homes of defenseless populations.

Moreover, people who violate the principles are responsible to common law. In each one of the countries represented here, the perpetrator of such crimes is liable for punishment, whatever his standing or nationality. It is difficult to see why the fact that he belongs to an enemy country should render him immune from punishment.

Let us never again forget this: the finest principles, the most firmly established laws and moral codes, run every risk of being ignored unless sanctions are applied. Since time immemorial, man's conscience has disapproved of killing and stealing, and yet, in all the countries which today we call civilized, high roads only became safe when the authority of their ruler became strong enough to seize, in the act, the perpetrators of acts of brigandage, and to have them well and truly hanged.

Exemplary punishment to fit the greatness of the crime is a satisfaction urgently demanded by the conscience of the oppressed peoples, by their need for justice as well as their desire for security. The effectiveness of the warning which we are giving today will be all the greater since the premonitory signs of the enemy's defeat will hasten the hour of final reckoning.

Twice a victim of German barbarity, Belgium is more acutely aware than most nations of the necessity of this decision that we are about to take. I am sure my words will meet with the approval of all my fellow-countrymen when I say that for my country this does not merely mean an empty demonstration but rather an obligation which we have incurred with other nations, a steadfast resolution which will be carried into execution as soon as might is once more in the service of right.

Belgian Library of Information, New York, 1942.

Paul-Henri Spaak, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Article, March 11, 1942

It is difficult for us Europeans to decide economic problems until we know the future political complexion of Germany. And I doubt if anyone has the answer to Germany's political setup after this war is over. But I am convinced that some kind of international organization, such as the League of Nations, is essential to the future welfare of the world. But it must be an organization functioning under entirely new rules, and with power to enforce its decisions.

The defects of the old League were three. First, the pact implied political obligations but it offered no economic advantages. Any similar organization after this war must hold out economic advantages to its members.

Second, the League had no armed force with which to carry out its decrees. Such an organization must have an armed force in the future.

And third, the League's rule of unanimity also prevented it from reaching any practical decisions. Such a paralyzing rule would have no place in any future international body.

Let us remedy these defects; and I believe this essential international organization will work.

It seems doubtful if frontiers will be abolished. But because of regional agreements, such as have just been reached between Yugoslavia and Greece, on the one hand, and Poland and Czechoslovakia on the other, I am certain that tariff barriers will be superseded if not suppressed. These regional agreements are a good way to tackle the reconstruction of Europe.

Louisville Courier-Journal, March 11, 1942.

Agreement between the United Kingdom and Belgium, Signed by Paul-Henri Spaak, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, London, June 4, 1942

The agreement deals with the organization and the use of Belgian metropolitan armed forces situated in or based upon the United Kingdom. In the agreement the two governments reaffirm their determination to prosecute the war to its successful conclusion, and reaffirm that one of the aims of the war is the re-establishment of the freedom and independence of Belgium, through complete liberation from German domination.

News from Belgium, II, p. 191.

Mutual Aid Agreement between the United States and Belgium, June 16, 1942

[For text of master agreement see section United Nations, p. 10;
for text see *D. S. Bul*, VI, p. 551-3]

Paul-Henri Spaak, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Speech on Anniversary of Independence Day, London, July 21, 1942

We will see Belgium free once more, then we must rebuild, tend the wounds inflicted by war and the occupation.

May we be worthy, at that hour, of the task entrusted to us.

A magnificent opportunity will arise for us to work for a new Belgium, to overcome the old disputes which so often turned us from the essential tasks. May Belgium be united, prosperous and social. But in order to achieve our hopes, we must dare, we must strive.

So many things in our public life deserve to be maintained that we must destroy those that can serve no longer.

Monarchy, the Constitution, our good sense, our power to work, an admirable colonial empire will be our trump cards at the very start. They are sufficient to enable us to win.

Belgian Library of Information, New York.

Hubert Pierlot, Prime Minister: Speech at London, October 18, 1942

The first thing that the makers of New Europe must do is to render any further war impossible. We must so organize the world that no country will be able to organize itself militarily. The obvious way to control every country is to maintain a powerful international aviation which will insure this comparative disarmament by bombing away any attempt to arm in order to prepare war. Then, the closest entente must be

created between nations desiring peace and having the same aims in view. The entente must not be purely military but economic. Such solidarity can easily be created between nations that are the most threatened by Germany, as also by those countries between which there is a similarity of structure and of political idealism

Belgian Library of Information, New York.

7. GREECE

Greece is a monarchy, having decided by a plebiscite in 1935 to reject the republican form of government established in March 1924 following a revolution. The throne was restored to King George II, who had fled from Greece during an uprising against him in December 1923. He resumed his rule on November 25, 1935. On August 4, 1936, Parliament was dissolved by Royal decree and the constitutional rights of citizens were suspended. All laws were thereafter enacted by Royal decree. All political parties were abolished and General John Metaxas acted as Premier with a non-party cabinet. On April 13, 1939, Great Britain and France guaranteed the frontiers of Greece.¹

1940

Oct. 28 Attack by Italy across Albanian border prior to expiration of ultimatum, thus creating a state of war. Successful resistance was offered.

1941

Jan. 29 Mr. Koryzis became Premier on the death of General Metaxas.

Apr. 6 Invasion by German troops over the Bulgarian frontier. British and Imperial troops aided Greek resistance

" 21 E. J. Tsouderos became Premier on the death of Mr. Koryzis.

" 22 General Tsolakoglu signed an armistice with Italy and Germany which was disavowed the next day by the King and his Government.

" 23 Invasion by Bulgarian troops. Diplomatic relations with Bulgaria severed. King George II removed his Government from Athens to Crete

" 27 Athens entered by German troops.

May 20 The King and Government left Crete for Egypt.

Sept. 22 The King and Government reached London.

" 24 Cabinet under Prime Minister Tsouderos constituted in London.

Oct. 22 A "Constituent Act" repealed the act of 1936 and outlined the Government's constitutional prerogatives.

Nov. 5 Joint Declaration by Greece, Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia at the International Labor Organization Conference, New York City (see p. 414).

Dec. 8 Declaration of war on Japan.

1942

Jan. 13 Allied Declaration signed on punishment for war crimes (see p. 7).

" 14 Joint Declaration of the Steering Committee (Greece, Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia) of the Central and Eastern European Planning Board (see p. 8).

" 15 Agreement with Yugoslavia providing for political, economic and military cooperation and outlining a constitution for a future Balkan Union (see p. 535).

¹ U.K., *Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 346, 13; *B I.N.*, 1939, XVI, p. 19-21

1942

- Mar. 9 Agreement with the United Kingdom whereby Greece received lend-lease aid and arrangements were made concerning the organization and employment of the Greek armed forces in collaboration with British forces.
- Jul. 10 Mutual Aid Agreement with the United States (see p. 542).

A. Tambacopoulos, Minister of Justice: Broadcast from Athens, November 9, 1940

[Official Translation]

Greece is now fighting for her rights and her existence. Greece has unshakable faith in the value of national honor and she has the will to fight to the end. Ancient Greece civilized the world. Byzantine Greece preserved that heritage through the Dark Ages and transmitted it to the West. Modern Greece demands nothing but independence and freedom to work.

Hellenic Institute of International and Foreign Law,
Ministry of Justice, *Italy's Aggression against Greece*,
Athens, National Printing Office, 1940, p. 4.

Genl. John Metaxas, Prime Minister: Proclamation, November 22, 1940

... When Mussolini decided to subjugate Greece we took the decision not to be exterminated. We will live, and with our ally Britain we will conquer. Our path will not be strewn with flowers, but we will face all dangers and we will conquer the enemy.

We fight not only for our existence but for the other Balkan peoples and the liberation of Albania. We are struggling for ideals whose importance transcends our boundaries and the boundaries of the Balkans, and extends to all humanity. We should thank God, whose providence has once more designated Greece as a champion in such a supreme struggle.

D.A.F.R., III, p. 314.

King George II: Message to the President of the United States (Roosevelt), December 3, 1940

Guardians across the seas of the ideals for which throughout the centuries Greeks have lived and died, Americans today are aware that the Greek nation is again fighting for the principles of justice, truth and liberty, without which life for us is inconceivable.

D. S. Bul., III, p. 503; for further material see
D.A.F.R., III, p. 311-23.

Genl. John Metaxas, Prime Minister: New Year's Message to the Greek People, January 1, 1941

We begin 1941 resolved to fight to the last breath until the enemy has been exterminated in the knowledge that our struggle will be long and hard, and that we shall suffer, but we are determined, and we will endure all in order to bring our struggle to a conclusion worthy of our Greece: and it is such a glorious and worthy conclusion which I wish you, people of Greece, as the New Year begins.

B.I.N., 1941, XVIII, p. 43.

Genl. John Metaxas, Prime Minister: Press Interview, January 5, 1941

He said their war aim was "to assure the integrity and independence of our country, the free development of Greece, and her moral and material strength—but never to the detriment of other peoples. . . . Greece must be strong in the Mediterranean. We want a powerful Greece with an inspiring moral force That certainly does not mean that we can allow our racial brothers to remain in foreign hands "

B.I.N., 1941, XVIII, p. 43.

*King George II: Manifesto, Athens, April 23, 1941*¹

. . . Our will, the will of the Government and of the Greek people has been manifested many times in favor of resisting to the end. Greek troops . . . are still fighting for the sake of the right cause. . . .

I-A.R., 1941, I, 4, p. 6; *D.A.F.R.*, III, p. 321.

Emmanuel J. Tsouderos, Prime Minister: Broadcast from Alexandria, June 4, 1941

Greeks! As those of Thermopylae and Constantinople, the martyrdom of Crete will always give new impetus to the ideals of our nation in the coming centuries, and from the ashes of the struggle in Albania, in Thrace and in Crete the phoenix of Greek liberty will revive once again. In fact, in the middle of our bitter ordeal we can already see the dawn of the sacred day of liberty. The fight is carried on; we shall take unflinchingly the hard road which will lead us to the fulfillment of Greek and world ideals. At the side of our great Allies, reorganized Greek land,

¹ Proclaimed before departure of King and Crown Prince to Crete The Greek Government removed to Cairo on May 25, and later established the seat of government in London.

sea and air forces are ready to fight the enemy for the liberation of Hellas wherever they meet him. While 8 millions of Greeks, although oppressed under the yoke of the enemy, do not hesitate to proudly face the conqueror, one million of Greeks abroad give all the moral and material support in their power to our sacred struggle

We have only one aim: to win; and only one hope. how to win. We are confident that we shall win. We shall because God and the right are on our side and because Greece never dies. We suffered and we will suffer more. But our patience and our perseverance must and shall be inexhaustible. We shall never fail to keep deeply engraved in our hearts the vision of a free Greece. With God's help and the assistance of our great Allies it will be surely realized soon. And then, united as one, imbued with a mutual solidarity forged in the common struggle and sacrifice, we shall see the national aspirations completely satisfied. We will build a Greece more beautiful and greater than ever, making it the pride and setting the example for all the free nations of the world

Greeks! Unite as one man more closely than ever around our national symbols, around our flag and our heroic King. Keep your heads high as men who have been victorious. Do not trust the enemy; and have confidence in the final victory. Help each one of you, with every means at your disposal in order that we may achieve the final victory. Help our country to overcome the present misfortunes until the glorious day of liberation of a Greece great and new.

I-A.R, 1941, I, 5, p. 10-11.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Charalampos Simopoulos, Minister to the United Kingdom: Speech on Adoption of the Resolution, June 12, 1941

The ideals of justice, peace and collaboration which are contained in this Resolution have inspired my country since the last war. We can, without exaggeration, claim that the Graeco-Turkish friendship constituted one of the most significant events of the post-war period in the establishment of peace. The exchange of populations between Turkey and Greece, harsh though it was, facilitated this work. The Graeco-Turkish friendship rendered possible the creation of the Balkan Entente, which was directed against no one and aimed at the safeguarding of the peace of the Balkan States. Greece proceeded to the exchange of populations with Bulgaria also, so that all causes of friction could be eliminated. My country, the most homogeneous of the Balkan States, took the lead in the movement toward a general Balkan understanding, and

was the moving spirit in the inter-Balkan conferences, in which Bulgaria participated. The purpose of all these efforts was peace. This peace would have been assured and the Balkans, united, could have looked forward to happy days of collaboration, had not Bulgaria, the enemy of the Balkans and of peace, frustrated these efforts. Running no danger from her neighbors, she refused to participate in the Balkan understanding, waiting for the first suitable moment, almost by tradition now, to stab her neighbors. And this moment came: the New Order, which was an old acquaintance for Bulgaria. We had no common frontier with Germany; Bulgaria hastened to provide one by opening wide her doors to the "tourists," those apostles of the New Order, who prepared the ground in Bulgaria so that later the mechanized divisions of the German dictator could launch their attack from the Bulgarian border against Greece and against the Imperial Forces which had so chivalrously come to our aid, since for this country liberty has no frontiers. It is, therefore, with particular satisfaction that I have noted that in the Resolution mention is made of Germany and her associates, that is to say, her accomplices.

Such were our efforts for peace. But Italy, treacherously and without reason, attacked us; then Germany. Now Bulgaria as well has occupied Greek territory. For our independence and our freedom we have sacrificed everything. The British Empire has fought by our side without reckoning the risks, thus giving a splendid example of solidarity. Our territory has been occupied, but with our heroic King and our legal Government we will continue to struggle to the end with all the means at our disposal, by the side of our Allies, until the triumph of liberty and the establishment of peace and free collaboration between nations in a liberated Europe. In the conviction of a common victory, and in the name of the Royal Hellenic Government, I accept the text of the Resolution, which constitutes a solemn proclamation of solidarity of the Governments of the Allied nations.

U.K., Cmd. 6285, Misc. No. 1 (1941), p. 13-14;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 5, p. 3.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Emmanuel J. Tsouderos, Prime Minister: Speech on Adoption of the First Resolution (Atlantic Charter), September 24, 1941*¹

I should like to refer to the telegram which I sent to the British Prime Minister as soon as I heard of the Anglo-American Atlantic Declaration.

¹ See section United Nations, p. 3.

This Declaration officially recognizes that the war aims of the Allied Powers remain on the same high level which they have occupied in the conscience and soul of the free democratic countries of the world since the beginning of the struggle. We are all fighting for an ideal; to destroy the violent and brutal method of force used by the aggressors, and to liberate the peoples of the world. Inspired by these ideals, and with an unshakable confidence in the triumph of our cause, I accept the resolution now proposed.

U.K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 11;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 5.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Emmanuel J. Tsouderos, Prime Minister: Speech on Adoption of the Second Resolution (Post-war Economic Needs of Europe), September 24, 1941¹

In the name of the Royal Hellenic Government, I wish to associate myself fully with the resolution whose text has been proposed to this Assembly by the Government of His Britannic Majesty. The Royal Hellenic Government will be glad to be represented on the Committee which it is intended to set up with the object of deciding the needs of our country within the general framework of an inter-Allied plan. I am taking this opportunity to put before this meeting a short memorandum in which various detailed considerations are set out briefly within the framework of the text which has been submitted to us, and with which we, for our part, are very glad to associate ourselves without reserve. . . .

U.K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 25;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 9.

Joint Declaration of Delegates of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia, at the International Labor Conference, New York, November 5, 1941

[For text see section Czechoslovakia, p. 414]

Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, January 13, 1942

[For text see United Nations, p. 7.]

Agreement between the Kingdom of Greece and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia Concerning the Constitution of a Balkan Union, London, January 15, 1942

Having observed past experience, and more particularly recent experiences, which have demonstrated that a lack of close understanding

¹ See section United Nations, p. 4.

between the Balkan peoples has caused them to be exploited by the powers of aggression in their aim toward political and military penetration and domination of the peninsula, and considering that in order to assure the independence and peace of the Balkan States the fundamental principles of their policy must be the principle of "The Balkans for the Balkan peoples," His Majesty, the King of the Hellenes, and His Majesty, the King of Yugoslavia, have decided to conclude the present Agreement concerning the Constitution of a Balkan Union and to that effect have named their plenipotentiaries. . . . These Ministers have agreed to the following dispositions:

CHAPTER ONE: ORGANS OF THE UNION

ARTICLE I The Organs of the Union which will meet at regular intervals are:

1. A Political Organ constituted by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, and
2. An Economic and Financial Organ constituted by two members of each Government who will be competent in economic and financial matters.

ARTICLE II. The Permanent Military Organ. This Organ, wherein the Governments will be represented by their chiefs or by their Representatives will constitute at the side of the National General Staffs a Common General Staff of the National Armies. This Organ will comprise two bureaus, one for the Army and Aviation and the other for the Navy.

ARTICLE III. A Permanent Bureau will comprise three sections:

- A. Political.
- B. Economic and Financial.
- C. Military.

ARTICLE IV. The Presidents of the Councils of Ministers of the States composing the Union will meet whenever circumstances require, in order to discuss questions of a general order of interest to the Union.

ARTICLE V. Collaboration between Parliaments. The Governments of the Union will facilitate regular meetings between parliamentary delegations of the States of the Union, allowing these delegations to proceed to exchanges of views and of expressions of their wishes in the form of questions of common interest which would be submitted to them by competent organs.

CHAPTER TWO: BUSINESS OF THE ORGANS OF THE UNION

ARTICLE VI. (1) The task of the Political Organ will be:

A. To coordinate the foreign policy of the members with a view to enabling the Union to act in a uniform manner on an international plane and to proceed with preliminary consultation at all times when the vital exterior interests of the members of the Union should be menaced.

B. To prepare projects for agreements of conciliation and arbitration between the members of the Union. The Political Organ will undertake the constitution of the following Organizations:

a. A Commission charged with the elaboration of agreements of intellectual cooperation between members of the Union and with the supervision of their application.

b. A Commission charged with the coordination of the efforts of the Organs of the members in view of the reciprocal rapprochement of public opinion in States which are members of the Union, and of the defense of their interests.

ARTICLE VII. (2) The task of the Economic and Financial Organ will be:

A. To coordinate the policies of exterior commerce and customs tariffs with a view to the conclusion of a customs union.

B. An elaborate common economic plan for members of the Union.

C. To constitute by means of special organs all means which will permit the amelioration of communications between members of the Union (railways, roads, navigation by sea, air and river, posts and telegraph), as well as tourist development within the Union.

D. To prepare a draft of an Agreement instituting a Balkan monetary union.

ARTICLE VIII. (3) The task of the Military Organ will be to coordinate activities concerning collaboration of the international organs of the members of the Union, adoption of a common plan of defense and a common type of armament, etc. The mission of the armed forces of the Union will be to defend the European frontiers of the States of the Union.

ARTICLE IX. (4) The permanent bureau will form a secretariat of the different organs of the Union and its task will be:

A. To prepare material for the labors of the Organs of the Union.

B. To study all questions the solution of which may render more efficacious the political, economic, financial and military cooperation of the members of the Union

C. To supervise the application of the decisions of the Organs of the Union.

CHAPTER THREE

ARTICLE X. The High Contracting Parties declare that this Agreement presents the general foundations for the organization of a Balkan Union. They consider themselves bound by the foregoing dispositions from the date of exchange of the instruments of ratification, and they envisage with satisfaction the future adhesion to this Agreement of other Balkan States ruled by governments freely and legally constituted. . . .

ARTICLE XI. The present Agreement will be ratified, and the ratifications will be exchanged, as soon as this is possible. In witness whereof, the representative plenipotentiaries have hereto placed their signatures and their seals.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 25-6; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 275,
B.I.N., 1942, XIX, p. 53-5.

Anglo-Greek Agreement Signed by the Greek Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Emmanuel J. Tsouderos and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, Anthony Eden, Concerning the Organization and Employment of the Greek Armed Forces, London, March 9, 1942

In this Agreement the two Governments confirm their determination to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion in the closest cooperation, and agree that among the objects of the war are the complete liberation of Greece and the re-establishment of her freedom and independence. . . .

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 100.

*King George II: Message to the Greeks Living in the United States (Anniversary of Greece's Independence), March 25, 1942*¹

For the first time in 120 years since that day when, in the Monastery of Aghia Lavra, our fathers raised the honored and sacred banner of Greek freedom, the 25th of March finds our country under a hateful yoke. Our country is suffering, bleeding, hunger-stricken, but not enslaved. For if the steel-girt enemy in his myriads contrived at last to

¹ For other speeches see *Let Freedom Ring*, issued by American Friends of Greece, New York, 1942, 18 p.

vanquish our arms that for six months had won the most triumphant of victories, the spirit of the Greek people was not, nor ever will be vanquished. This spirit today proclaims the good tidings that Greece will rise again. The whole race will put forth its strength in this work of resurrection. By its side it has valued helpers, the great and civilized nations that fight for the freedom of the world. In the forefront of these nations stands the glorious North American Union of which you have the honor to be worthy citizens. Its boundless power, both moral and material, will soon give its highest yield. Then will sound the hour of victory for us Greeks. That hour will also be the hour of redemption, the hour, too, to build a new and greater and more beautiful Greece which shall live under a free constitution in consonance with the principles for which the democracies today are fighting. At this solemn moment, I send you, my fellow countrymen in America, my warm greetings.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 79.

King George II: Address to the Congress of the United States, Washington, June 15, 1942

. . . The great ideals with which the United States today inspires the peoples of the world will contribute not only to the happier conclusions of the current war but will provide the foundations of the happier and more harmonious life after the war which humanity expects.

Decency and justice must govern relations between people in the post-war world, which must not be left a prey to vandalism a further time. In order to achieve this result the machinery of international cooperation must be strengthened so as to utilize, in order under law, the tremendous resources of peace-loving peoples. The economic life of the nations must be reorganized in a manner which shall secure to all the well-being to which the plain men and women of the world are entitled.

Above all else, it is vital that those who have fought the battle of right be secured against invasion, and the wrong-doers — including those who either for ulterior motives or simply because of weakness permitted themselves to become tools of the Axis — be impressed that predatory policies do not pay. The preservation of freedom is not the obligation of any single people in any one part of the world; it is an obligation of all peace-loving peoples throughout the world. This simple truth is the base rock of international understanding and the cornerstone for cooperation between free men in the world to come.

Greece with its limited resources is wholeheartedly at the service of these ideals. Today when more than ever victory is clearly discernible on the flaming horizon, she is determined to contribute whatever she can toward that victory. Knowing the boundless resources which the American people are placing in motion for the common effort I feel duty bound to speak with great modesty of my country's contribution to the same cause. However small that contribution may appear to be, in contrast with what you are doing, it is everything we have. With all our free fighting men who have survived, with all our ships which have not been sunk, we will fight on land, we will fight on sea, and we will fight in the air, to the very end, by your side and by the side of the other United Nations, until barbaric violence is put down and a new world is established — a world for free men, not for slaves

Cong. Rec., vol. 88, p. 5403; *I-A.R.*, 1942, II, 6, p. 135.

*King George II: Address before the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, June 18, 1942*¹

. . . Yet Greece still ardently believes that there is something good in store for the world when this war and its sacrifices are over, and that she will share in it. She has a congenital belief in the progress of the human spirit — the humane, the tolerant, the inquiring spirit — what I like to think has justly been called the Greek spirit.

In large part Greece bases this faith of hers on the declarations of the great leaders of the Anglo-American world. Your President's and Mr. Churchill's famous Four Freedoms, the spirit of which animated the Atlantic Charter, seemed to me an expression of this humane, this Greek, spirit. Greece associated herself immediately with this promise of a better world of tomorrow.

Freedom of security for the State, freedom from want for her citizens — these Greece hopes for. The other two freedoms are part of her inheritance and tradition.

Security is what she craves most of all. She wants a chance to work and produce, plant and reap, hope and love and live in her own house, free and secure. The task of recovery which she must face will entail heroic labors. It will take generations of her citizens to repair her losses, her wounds, her ruins. To deny real security to her and to other smaller nations in the future would be too cruel to contemplate.

¹ For other speeches given by the King during his stay in the United States and Canada, see *Greece Undaunted Still Fights On*, issued by the Greek Office of Information, New York, 1942, 31 p

Whatever Greece can do to help establish and maintain a system of security I feel confident she will do. I believe that will be in her own enlightened self-interest. I might go so far as to say that such a course is in the enlightened self-interest of any nation, great or small, which is not a pirate nation, which does not seek to reap what others have sown, to steal what others have produced, to live where others have built.

Freedom from want for her citizens Greece will seek to attain through the exploitation of those human values that have been the mainstay of the Greek people for thousands of years. But to succeed she will need an international economic order which will allow the free play of her people's ability and versatility of skills.

As part of this, she will need a rational international trade system like that pursued by your eminent Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, in which she will be able to trade the fruits of her specialized cultures and her natural wealth with the industrial products of other countries.

Greece will also need to repair the immense losses of her shipping and re-establish the conditions that have permitted her people, from the most ancient times, to trade across all the seas and so supplement the meager resources of her soil.

The lessons of these years impose upon us all the duty of taking whatever part we can in the task of integrating international society in all its branches — political, economic, social. We knew before that this was the direction in which the world ought to move. Now we know that unless it moves in that direction, we perish. The world must gradually become one whole, leaving scope for different cultures and talents, but refusing any longer to permit the strong to browbeat the weak, or the civilization which we cherish, to the development of which Greece has contributed her share, will come to an end. . . .

N.Y.T., June 19, 1942.

Joint Statement by the President of the United States (Roosevelt) and the King of Greece (George II), Washington, July 9, 1942

. . . We are firm in our determination to win the peace no less than the war, and we reassert our conviction that a just and lasting peace, based on an honest application of the Declaration of the United Nations of January 1, 1942, is the basis on which the peace shall be won.

In consequence, the Prime Minister of Greece and the Secretary of State will sign tomorrow, on behalf of their Governments, an agreement on the principles applying to mutual aid in the prosecution of the war,

by which the American and Greek Governments pledge not only their mutual resources to a common victory but their collaboration in economic policies to make possible a lasting peace. . .

D. S. Bul., VII, p. 601.

Mutual Aid Agreement between the United States and Greece, July 10, 1942

[For text of master agreement see section United Nations p. 10;
for text see *D S Bul.*, VII, p. 602]

Emmanuel J. Tsouderos, Prime Minister: Address to the Young Men and Women of Greece, September 22, 1942

We address ourselves to you, who are the hope of the nation — . . .

By now, everyone has become conscious that we are not fighting merely to preserve our free existence. We feel that we are continuing a historic struggle which in the past kindled revolutions and civil wars, and shattered obsolete social forms — a struggle which, as we perceive, is now reaching an important stage in its evolution, to the furtherance of human rights. That is why you must look to the future, in the shaping of which you will play a major responsible part . . .

Let us use this capital to create a Greece where national solidarity and social justice shall become realities; where family, religion and school shall find their rightful place and wherein, each Greek home, now harassed by endless hardships shall find, at last, the blessings of security, comfort and peace. . . .

The State of tomorrow will necessarily change its form; it will be far wider in scope and far more social, since the assistance of all social forces will be utilized; in other words, it will prove to be a far more just institution than it has been up to now. For, whatever its present actions in the political field may be, the State will be setting aside realities if it cannot simultaneously assure to everyone the means for a tolerable standard of living. All who have some experience of public life and who know what is presupposed by the State's undertaking such a mission will realize how much preparation and, subsequently, how much work is needed, if the right to a decent life for all is to be guaranteed, not only against visible dictatorship, but against the hidden dictatorships of money and unscrupulous ingenuity. All this is the whole of the social problem of our age and whether we wish it or not, we shall have to turn our whole attention to it; for if we do not find a solution to this particular aspect, the pressure of the classes subjected to economic and social injustice

will sweep away our political structure in its entirety, and with it, our liberties.

It is around such ideas and such principles — which cannot, of course, be realized in one day, but which will require of you to exert ceaseless efforts, over a long period of time, with perseverance and unswerving faith, that our country's new political life will be moulded. Divergencies of political view will and must exist; through the new political parties that will emerge, they will find their fit expression. In these political struggles it is you who will choose your representatives and it is you, again, who will give to the nation its new intellectual leaders. Thus by means of a free but ethical press, and true popular representation, which, standing remote from personal interests, will devote itself to the service of the general welfare, you will rule and shape the new Greek world. You deserve it and I pray that you will have it, so that you may give to our country its just place in the new society of nations which will emerge from this war. . . .

The international social and ethical principles will be restored by post-war world reforms which will protect them against future insidious assault through the agency of international solidarity and by the collaboration of all free peoples. Collaboration of the free peoples will also win the peace. Without it, the world will run a great risk of falling into anarchy and poverty — thereby, peace itself will prove meaningless to the suffering peoples.

I have mentioned these things, because the role you must play reaches far beyond our national boundaries; it is international. . . .

All this will be accomplished, provided you desire it. Prepare yourselves. Do not think that everything will be easy after the war. Do not forget the great lesson we have learned from its woes, the lesson of the necessity of mutual assistance and collaboration, both within and without our frontiers. Above all, if you want to succeed, look only ahead, never look back. He who looks back, stumbles.

Greek Office of Information, Washington, D. C.

A. Michalopoulos, Minister of Information: Address to the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, November 16, 1942

. . . I will pass to the wider theme of a durable peace settlement. President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill rendered a signal service to humanity when, at a timely moment, they signed the historic Atlantic Charter and laid the broad foundation of eventual international agreement. After the savage din of war has subsided and exhausted humanity

has laid down its arms, there is no doubt that all the nations of the world, without exception, will be eager for real peace and concord. But at that moment we must guard against being overcome by indifference, which may well arise from a latent conviction in the minds of those who will negotiate the peace, that in their life-time at least it will not be possible for the nations to fight again. This kind of indifference is most insidious for it might well lead to careless patchwork, whereas what the world needs is as much courage and determination in building up the world's fabric as has been shown in preventing its total destruction by Nazi tyranny.

To my mind the principal crime which Hitler has committed is that by his nefarious system he has built up against the people of Germany and her associates such a wall of hatred amongst the nations who have temporarily become their victims, that to expect universal good will to follow the signature of peace would be an excursion into a Utopia of the most dangerous nature. . . .

Now what are you going to do with Germany after the war? We have all of us turned this question over in our minds again and again, no doubt, and when you give me an answer to it, I will give you the answer to the question what are we going to do with Bulgaria? I have told you what is at present taking place. It is, therefore, going to be extremely difficult for us to settle our differences with that country on an amicable basis. But I think you can count on Greece taking the initiative in making a bona fide attempt to arrive at a working arrangement in Southeastern Europe. Her past record is a guarantee of this. And at a time when the great nations in the world were at sixes and sevens, Greece, through the foresight of her great statesman Eleutherios Venizelos, patched up her age-long quarrel with Turkey and came to an agreement with her, which has not only proved permanent but has been one of the stabilizing factors in that formerly explosive corner of the Mediterranean. It was Greece, too, that took the lead in promoting the Balkan Entente, which did everything in its power to include Bulgaria within its folds. . . .

After this war the teeth of the aggressor powers must be drawn. There is no doubt about that. When they have been drawn satisfactorily and a certain time has been given to the victims of aggression to recover from their injury, a *modus vivendi*, which will look to the future and to the promotion of lasting peace, must be found. Of that we are fully conscious. Quite what form this *modus vivendi* will take it is impossible to forecast in detail at the present moment. . . . But I do think that the Greek-Yugoslav Pact for a Balkan Union signed in London on

January 15 last gives a view of the intentions of our two countries in this respect. This Pact was taken to be a step towards progressive agreement in that it provides for constant collaboration and consultation between the statesmen of the two countries. The Prime Ministers will meet at stated intervals, also the Foreign Ministers, the Finance Ministers, and the political and economic bodies, once they have been set up in order to further this collaboration, will help to make it a permanent affair. Parliamentary Committees from both Parliaments will also collaborate. The most important thing, I think, is the provision for the suppression of customs barriers and the desire that is expressed for the closest financial and economic collaboration which means in effect that the collaboration of Yugoslavia and Greece in all spheres will be complete and will amount to something much more than any alliance. In fact the word "union" is the proper word to use. Perhaps the most important clause is that which holds out a promise that any other Balkan power who wishes to join will be welcome, provided that its government has been freely elected, and that it accepts the terms of the agreement. Thus our aim is to evolve a truly Balkan union, and the Greek and Yugoslav Governments are both sincerely desirous of using all their influence and exerting all their patience in order that this ideal may be realized.

In the more general international situation there are certain factors which emerge clearly enough and which may have been, and in any case ought to be, faced already. The first is, and I fear insufficient consideration is being given to it in many circles, the position of Russia after the war. . . . Russia's claims to a very big share in the control of the world's destinies at the end of the war are certainly not going to be locked up in any cupboard, and she will have her say in matters concerning the affairs of Southeastern Europe, where she has always exercised considerable influence over her spiritual associates, the Slav States. Possibly Russia may find the solution to the Bulgarian problem. She may manage to keep those truculent Tartars in order. She will, I believe, develop her affinities with the Yugoslavs.

From the Greek point of view I personally do not share the opinion that Russian influence across the northern boundaries of Greece will be a menace. . . .

As regards Greece, I feel that our problem is two-fold; We have to establish a firm foundation of amity and understanding with our Slav neighbors on the north, who will come under Russian influence, in order to be able to develop as a Mediterranean nation, whose chief source of prosperity is on the sea.

We have always been a maritime power and the flag of our merchant navy, in war no less than in peace, floats over the seven oceans. Through the wide lanes of maritime commerce we are brought into constant contact with Great Britain and the United States of America, and our affinities in cultural temperament and ideals with these democratic nations makes the development of even closer relations with them probable and highly desirable but we do need encouragement and support. For some years after the war we shall need much understanding and substantial material assistance in order to repair the ravages caused by the invasion of the barbarians and the establishment of the New Order. This also applies to all the occupied nations of Europe today.

Primarily the future of Eastern Europe no less than the future of the whole world depends upon the wisdom with which the great powers will assume their leadership at the end of the war . . . if real unity among them prevails, the great democratic nations will, I am sure, find willingness and alacrity on the part of the smaller nations to lay aside their individual differences and to follow their leadership in contributing to the creation of a new world in which decent men and women can live in security and comfort.

I-A.R., II, p. 327-9.

Emmanuel J. Tsouderos, Prime Minister: Comment in a Press Conference on Mr. Eden's Statement¹ in the House of Commons on Albanian Independence, December 17, 1942

Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden's declaration in Commons regarding the independence of Albania is in accord with the fundamental principles for which the democratic peoples are today fighting against the tyrants of the Axis group. Our struggle aims at the re-establishment of the freedom and independence of the peoples who have their own national consciousness and of those small countries which Germany proclaimed should become the slaves of the most powerful ones. Therefore, this statement justly contains certain reservations.

Firstly, territorial questions are not predetermined. For example, among others is the problem of Northern Epirus, which is of specific interest to Greece. These questions will be settled after the war, in accordance with the ineradicable, historic rights of those nations who have struggled, and with respect for their security against a repeated, dastardly aggression by neighbors.

¹ See section United Kingdom, p. 273.

Secondly, the statement does not apply to the political regime in Albania, nor to that country's form of government; because it is emphasized that these questions will be judged by the Albanian people after the war.

Thirdly, in relation to eventual agreements which may be concluded between the Balkan States, the position of Albania is not defined in advance by this statement. On the contrary, the interest of the neighboring Balkan countries for Albania is recognized in this statement; whereas, until now, the tendencies prevailing in Albania were those strengthening the imperialistic interests and designs of Italy.

Thus, the statement of the British Government, on the Independence of Albania, is not only in accordance with the principles for which we are fighting; but is also just in relation to the respective interests of its Balkan Allies.

Release by the Greek Office of Information.

8. YUGOSLAVIA

Yugoslavia is a monarchy in which the governing power was vested under the constitution in 1931 of the King and a Parliament of two Houses. King Peter II was proclaimed King upon the assassination of his father Alexander I, October 9, 1934, as he was still a minor. Yugoslavia was governed by a Regent until March 27, 1941 when the Regency was abolished by an Army revolution following the signature of the protocol of adherence to the Axis Tripartite Pact of September 27, 1940. King Peter ascended the throne on March 28, 1941 and appointed a new Cabinet with General R. D. Simovitch, chief of the Air Corps, as Prime Minister. The new Coalition Cabinet, including Yugoslav Radical, Croatian Peasant, Slovene Peoples, Yugoslav Democrat, Agrarian Independent Democratic and Yugoslav National Parties, refused to ratify the Axis pact. On April 5, 1941, a five-year Yugoslav-Soviet Treaty of friendship and non-aggression was signed at Moscow, coming into force on signature.

1941

- Apr. 6 Invasion by German troops. Germany declared war.
- " 17 Capitulation of the Yugoslav army.
- " 21 The King and his Cabinet reached Jerusalem and established their Government there.
- Jun. 26 The King and his Cabinet transferred their headquarters to London.
- Jul. 11 Declaration of support of the Soviet Union in the war against the Axis.
- Nov. 5 Joint Declaration of Yugoslavia, Greece, Poland and Czechoslovakia at the International Labor Conference, New York City (see p. 414).
- Dec. 9 Declaration of state of war with Japan.

1942

- Jan. 2 Reconstruction of the Government: Slobodan Jovanovitch succeeded General Simovitch as Prime Minister and General Mihailovitch, leader of the guerilla forces in Yugoslavia, was appointed Minister of War.

1942

- Jan 13 Allied Declaration on punishment for war crimes (see p 7)
 " 14 Joint Declaration by Yugoslavia, Greece, Poland and Czechoslovakia
 on the Central and Eastern European Planning Board (see p 8).
 " 15 Agreement signed with Greece providing for political, economic, and
 military cooperation and outlining a constitution for a future Balkan
 Union (see p. 535).
 Jun. 21 King Peter arrived in the United States for an extended visit
 Jul. 24 Mutual aid agreement with the United States (see p. 556)

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Ivan Subotitch,
 Minister to the United Kingdom: Speech on Accepting the Resolution,
 June 12, 1941*¹

[Translation]

In accepting the proposed Resolution, Yugoslavia shows her solidarity with the Governments of the Allied States and her confidence in the future, and protests against the ignoble proceedings of violence and the domination to which the aggressor powers resorted, and are still resorting, against the Yugoslav people (the Serbs, the Croats and the Slovenes) as well as against other Allied and friendly peoples. The war launched against Yugoslavia by the unprovoked aggression of Germany, of Italy, of Hungary, and of Bulgaria, as well as their attempt at dismembering the Yugoslav national territory, places those four powers in the same dock. Yugoslavia looks forward with confidence to the outcome of the war, in which she will not cease to take part with all her means, side by side with the Allied States. She feels confident that her Allies will assist her with all the means in their power in this struggle for the restoration of right and justice, and help her to free herself from all her enemies and entirely re-establish her frontiers and the freedom of Balkan nations. . . .

U. K., Cmd. 6285, Misc. No. 1 (1941), p. 14;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 5, p. 6.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Momtchilo Nin-
 chitch, Minister for Foreign Affairs: Speech on Adoption of the First
 Resolution (Atlantic Charter), September 24, 1941*¹

[Translation]

The Royal Yugoslav Government is glad to be able to welcome the collaboration of the two great democratic nations manifested at the Atlantic meeting which can save the world and civilization from the menacing danger of destruction. The ideas set forth in the Declaration of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, so opposed to those propagated and put into practice

¹ See section United Nations, p. 3.

so cruelly by the Axis Powers and their satellites, prove the existence of too deeply divided worlds. Instead of repression and the designs of the conqueror, the Declaration offers to the peoples independence and security in an atmosphere of international confidence; instead of exploitation, famine, and general misery it offers a basis of collaboration for the restoration of the vast material damage resulting from oppression by assuring in the future the normal development of economic relations between the countries.

The Yugoslav Government is, moreover, persuaded that in the execution of these principles which should assure peace, well-being, and prosperity to all peoples, the fact will not be overlooked that this high ideal can only be attained if conditions of international life are established which would give to the peoples a feeling of security and the conviction not only that aggression can never profit the aggressor but also that account will be taken of the damage caused by the aggressor. The conception of justice inspiring this Declaration which our country, so constantly menaced, will never cease to evoke, has our entire approval. It is clear that it will not be easy to put this conception into practice in a world divided by the aggressions and the barbarous treatments of which the peoples under military domination have been the victims. The inequality of the resultant positions in different nations is very great, and it will be necessary to take account of this inspired by the conception of justice. But the experience we have had of the events following the last Great War and leading up to this can provide a useful guide on this difficult road.

I have the honor to state, in the name of the Yugoslav Government, that we adhere to the principles set out in the Declaration of the President of the United States and of the British Prime Minister, Mr Churchill and that we are ready to collaborate to the limits of our means in the application of the principles set forth in the Declaration.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 15-16;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 6-7.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. Juraj Šutej, Minister of Finance: Speech on Adoption of the Second Resolution (Post-war Economic Needs of Europe), September 24, 1941*¹

[Translation]

In the name of the Royal Yugoslav Government, I have the honor to make the following statement: The Yugoslav Government has welcomed with the greatest satisfaction Mr. Eden's declaration on behalf of the

¹ See section United Nations, p. 4.

British Government and fully approves that Government's intention to begin from today preliminary work concerning the reprovisioning in foodstuffs and raw materials of the European countries immediately after the Armistice

The Yugoslav Government wishes to emphasize the special importance which it attaches to the problem of reprovisioning after the war. It realizes only too well that Yugoslavia will have been exhausted by the pitiless exploitation by armies of occupation which are removing by force all her reserves and all her agricultural produce, and are at the same time destroying by thoughtless exploitation the natural riches of the country in raw materials.

Account should also be taken of Yugoslavia's transport difficulties which will arise not only out of her geographical situation but also from the complete absence of means of transport which the enemy will not have failed to use up and even to destroy.

It is unnecessary to say with what a lively interest the Yugoslav Government has learned of the conversations between Great Britain and the United States, since they are convinced that collaboration with the United States over this question of the reprovisioning of European countries after the war is of the very first importance.

The Royal Yugoslav Government declares its agreement with the proposed resolution regarding the reprovisioning of Europe after the war.

The Yugoslav Government, approving the initiative taken by the British Government and all that has already been accomplished by the latter in this direction, has begun the organization of preparatory work for the reprovisioning of its country and will only take action in this connection in full concert with the Allied Governments.

The Yugoslav Government will produce a list of its most urgent needs as regards foodstuffs and raw materials, in such a way as to determine the priority of these needs in accordance with the general plan.

The Yugoslav Government wishes to set on foot, with the aid and collaboration of the Allied countries, every measure which can be of assistance in regard to the most rapid transport of the most indispensable goods, in accordance with an established plan. By a judicious use of her small merchant fleet, already seriously reduced by the war, Yugoslavia wishes to contribute all in her power to this end.

Similarly, the Yugoslav Government warmly appreciate the creation by the British Government of a bureau whose object it will be to achieve this end, and it remains firmly convinced that the Inter-Allied Committee, under the presidency of Sir Frederick Leith-Ross, will not fail to obtain the best possible results.

*Joint Declaration of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia,
at the International Labor Conference, New York, November 5, 1941*

[For text see section Czechoslovakia, p. 414]

*Konstantin Fotitch, Minister to the United States: Letter to the Editor
of The Washington Star Concerning Yugoslav-Bulgarian Relations,
November 29, 1941*

In his letter to *The Star* for November 21 the Bulgarian Minister again attempted to justify the act of unprovoked aggression which his Government and people have committed against Yugoslavia. In support of his arguments he quotes the opinions of Mr. Churchill and of the late Lord Grey, said to have been delivered some 30 years ago.

Whatever the opinions of these British statesmen may have been prior to the present time, they can only be cited to prove that at one time Britain may have had confidence in Bulgaria. That this confidence has been flagrantly abused and was entirely unmerited is obvious today. One need only refer to Mr. Churchill's recent pronouncements on the subject of Bulgaria and one can only imagine what Lord Grey would have said, had he been alive to witness the conduct of a Government which in spite of a "treaty of eternal friendship" has seen fit to snatch the territory of a neighbor already knocked down by the overwhelming force of the German Army. I have no need to defend the conduct of the Yugoslavs. They have taken up arms against overwhelming odds. They fought alone against the combined forces of Germany and Italy, which were joined in spite of their treaties of perpetual friendship with Yugoslavia by Hungary and Bulgaria. They have fought bravely and the continuation of their fight to this day has won for them the respect and admiration of the entire civilized world. They will not rest until Hitlerism and all it and its inglorious puppets represent is fully conquered.

One of the principal aims of this war is to restore the rule of order and decency in international relations. Nations cannot live and act like wild beasts that jump on their prey as soon as it is weak and exhausted. The Bulgarian Minister wants us to wait for the verdict of history before judging the act of his nation. History already has spoken. It has spoken through the voices of thousands and thousands of innocent victims of the terror which the Bulgarian Army has spread wherever it set foot on the conquered territories. It has spoken through the words of the President of the United States who did not hesitate to describe Bulgaria's action as an act of unprovoked aggression.

In every war during the past three decades, whenever the forces of justice and decency were pitted against those of evil and aggression,

Bulgaria found herself on the latter's side. No words of Schopenhauer, no opinions and no tenuous arguments will erase this fact. If Bulgaria wishes to regain the respect and good will of civilized nations; she can do so not by words but by deeds, she can do so by condemning the actions of a ruler and government who have attacked a weak and exhausted neighbor, she can do so by bringing to justice those who are responsible for the murder of thousands of innocent victims and for the pillage of their homes.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 13-14.

King Peter II: Report of Speech to National Defense and Public Interest Committee in London, December 17, 1941

He said the Regency made a fatal mistake when it began to abandon the foreign policy initiated by his father. Tomorrow Yugoslavia would again be the master of her own destiny. His own efforts would again be directed towards securing the unity of the different parts of the country for the sake of the whole, and towards ensuring that in a democratic order all the forces of the nation should find equal possibilities for developing themselves.

The Times, December 18, 1941.

Statement by the Cabinet (after Dr. Jovanovitch Had Succeeded General Simovitch as Prime Minister), London, January 13, 1942

The conclusion of the Atlantic Charter, the entry of the United States into the war and the recent success of democratic powers against the Axis in Europe and Africa have made it necessary for all the Allied Governments to turn their attention more and more to the question of the political and economic organization of Europe after the war.

In handling these questions the Kingdom of Yugoslavia has an important but difficult part to play, and it is essential that the Yugoslav Government should not only be truly representative of the whole country and able to speak authoritatively for Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, but should be fully qualified to take its share in the political discussions that must henceforth take place on important problems that are likely to arise.

At the time of its first Constitution in 1941 the immediate problem facing the government was a purely military one. Today it is desirable that the leadership of the government should be in political rather than military hands. Dr. Jovanovitch, a former Vice-Premier, commands the unqualified support of all the other Ministers and those whom they represent.

The new Government will continue to work for a steady development of relations and of close collaboration between Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and for defeat of the persistent and cunning efforts of the Axis Powers to sow discord between them

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 38.

Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, London, January 13, 1942

[For text see United Nations, p. 7.]

Joint Declaration of the General Steering Committee of the Central and Eastern European Planning Board (Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia), January 14, 1942

[For text see section United Nations, p. 8.]

Greek-Yugoslav Agreement, London, January 15, 1942

[For text see section Greece, p. 535]

King Peter II: Address at a Luncheon, Given in His Honor by Eduard Beneš, President of Czechoslovakia, London, January 19, 1942

[Translation]

. . . it is essential for both nations to enter into contact in good times and bad. Just as my father gave great importance to the Alliance with your country, so do I see in a close development of our political relations, a better future for all the nations of Central and Southeastern Europe. In Europe there is only one peace for all nations — and that is indivisible peace. If everyone to whom peace matters does not realize that it is necessary to insure it by a common effort and understanding, then the conflagration of war will again spread and attain enormous dimensions like every conflagration extinguished with insufficient means. Your efforts together with Poland for the formation of a Central European Union, and ours with Greece for the formation of a Balkan Union, show that we have drawn the necessary lesson from the fateful events. The geographical position and approximate balance of forces form analogous conditions for our countries. This fact alone already leads us to cooperate. For a common union of all states, I fully agree with you that a Czechoslovak-Yugoslav friendship will form an essential and very strong link.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 36.

King Peter II: Message to His People, March 27, 1942

In the fight with the enemy all of you — Serbs, Croats and Slovenes — will rise when the right time comes and the signal is given. Then you will together in an irresistible brotherly momentum, with the heroism which is in your blood clean the country of its conquerors. Our victory and that of our Allies, your heroism, your will and the absolute necessity of once again building up our common house, are a gauge for the reconstruction of our state. The experience we have gathered will serve us in good stead. We shall have to heal our wounds a long time. One of the main tasks of the whole community will be to educate the orphans of those parents who fell for the Fatherland, to take on our common shoulders all misfortunes, to give work to all willing hands — to give bread and shelter. A full independence of the state in foreign affairs, a full right of the people to determine its own destiny — those are two principles which were forcefully expressed at dawn of the 27th of March. They will remain the principles of my reign. Let this day, 27th of March, be not only for all of us and for myself a day of faith in our destiny, a day of national pride, but also a day of my vow with you, so that we may together and in unity work in full freedom for the progress and welfare of our Fatherland. So help us God.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 83.

King Peter II: Address before the Congress of the United States, Washington, June 25, 1942

. . . Our people, together with the other United Nations of the world have been thrown into a struggle, the outcome of which will decide for many centuries whether these nations are to live in freedom or eke out a miserable existence in slavery. This war is indivisible, and there can be no freedom anywhere if even the smallest country in any part of the world is enslaved. We did not choose it this way. The ruthless leaders of Germany, Italy, Japan and all their accomplices told us that we must all be destroyed. They are all our enemies; all of them must be defeated and all of us must be victorious. That is why the soldiers of the United Nations are all fighting the same battle. They may never have seen each other or even heard of each other but they are all united by the same destiny. . . .

It is for all those reasons that I do not feel a stranger in the Congress of the United States. The Congress represents the will of the American people, but it is also a champion and a guardian of those ideals and principles for which we all fight. . . .

We shall win this war. But we must also win the peace that will follow it. Never again must we permit the calamity of war to fall upon us. Never again must we permit a band of tyrants to plunge the entire world into misery and disaster. A lasting peace can never be attained until we purge the nations which today are ranged against us of wicked men whose lust and greed have wrecked many a peace-loving country such as mine. It is only when nations great and small no longer fear the specter of aggression that they will be able to devote all their energies to the pursuit of peace among the nations and of security and welfare within them.

We have welcomed and willingly accepted the principles of the Atlantic Charter with all its vast implications. In international relations we have already put its provisions into effect by signing a treaty of close political and economic union with our friend and neighbor, Greece. We hope that in the future this treaty will be adhered to by our other neighbors after they have rid themselves of those who are responsible for the crimes which have been committed in their names.

The Four Freedoms which your great President pledged to his own people will be the aim for which we will strive. We shall judge our citizens not by their political views, not by their racial or religious affiliations, but by their conduct in this present struggle. Whoever fought with us shall share with us in the blessings of victory.

My country has set her standard in the forefront of those who fight for freedom. We do not count the sacrifices and suffering, we do not measure the want and toil. We look only to the goal — the victory which once was dim and distant but to which we now draw near.

Cong Rec., vol. 88, p. 5740; *I-A.R.*, 1942, II, p. 164-5.

***King Peter II and the President of the United States (Roosevelt):
Joint Statement, Washington, July 24, 1942***

... In the discussions between the President and the King in the course of His Majesty's visit to the United States there has been a general review of the relations between the United States and Yugoslavia, and the problems of special concern to these two United Nations, with particular attention to the conduct of the war.

His Majesty's visit in this country has been made the occasion of a demonstration on the part of the American people of a very special friendship for the people of Yugoslavia, who have made such valiant sacrifice in defense of their cherished freedom and the liberation of their country.

We are in complete accord on the fundamental principle that all the resources of the two nations should be devoted to the vigorous prosecution of the war; that like the fine achievements of General Mihailovitch and his daring men, an example of spontaneous and unselfish will to victory, our common effort shall seek every means to defeat the enemies of all free nations

In these discussions, in which Dr. Momtchilo Nintchitch, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Royal Yugoslav Government, has participated, attention has been given also to the principles which should guide our countries in establishing an enduring and prosperous peace under a just application of the Declaration by the United Nations, and the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Accordingly the Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia and the Secretary of State have today signed, on behalf of their Governments, an agreement on the principles applying to mutual aid in the prosecution of the war, pledging their material and spiritual resources to a common victory of the United Nations.

D. S. Bul, VI, p. 647.

Mutual Aid Agreement between the Government of the United States and the Royal Yugoslav Government, July 24, 1942

[For text of master agreement see section United Nations, p. 10;
for text see *D. S. Bul*, VI, p. 647-9.]

Juraj Krnjević, Vice-President: Broadcast, London, November 16, 1942

. . . the day will come when the people's voice in Croatia shall be once again stronger than the foreign force that today keeps Pavelitch in the saddle. Then the Croatian people will judge all the criminals according to their demerits. No one shall escape such a judgment. Among other crimes I am going to emphasize just one for which we shall seek a special settlement, and that is the one of enforced Catholicism. To force anyone with a sword toward changing his or her faith is much more repulsive than to murder one physically. . . .

. . . Neither the Croats nor the Serbs have any justifiable reasons for creating an unbridgeable gap between themselves. On the contrary, their present situation obviously proves that it is absolutely necessary for both of them to lay the foundation for a coordinated and orderly common life. . . .

Our entire past and present experience teaches us that we can expect a better future for everyone only in a federated and democratic Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Such a Yugoslavia will secure for all of us peace, harmony, progress and a better future and will also make us useful members of the international commonwealth.

Royal Yugoslav Information Center, New York.

9. COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES

The Philippines Independence Act of 1934 provided for a ten-year period of political and economic readjustment preparatory to full independence. During this period, the Philippines were to remain part of the United States, whose officials retained certain ultimate authority and were responsible for the protection of the islands. A United States High Commissioner represented the President. The Commonwealth was governed by President Quezon, in office continuously since September 1935, and a Cabinet of the National Party, the only party represented in Parliament.

1941

Dec. 7 Attack by the Japanese.

1942

Apr. 9 Surrender of American and Filipino forces.

Jun. 10 Adherence to the Joint Declaration by United Nations.

Adherence to Declaration by United Nations: Manuel L. Quezon, President of the Commonwealth, Note to Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, June 10, 1942

The people of the Philippines are wholeheartedly devoted to liberty and fully subscribe to the principles set forth in that great document known as the Atlantic Charter which was proclaimed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941.

We have been battling since December 7, 1941, to preserve our country from the menace of Japanese aggression. Although a large part of our territory is overrun by Japanese military forces, our soldiers are still actively engaged in meeting and harassing the foe wherever possible. We do not intend to be cowed by the armed might of Japan. We shall continue the struggle with every means in our power.

We desire to associate ourselves with those nations which are fighting for the preservation of life and liberty against the forces of barbarism that seek world domination. Accordingly, the Commonwealth of the Philippines hereby formally adheres to the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942.

D.S. Bul., VI, p. 547; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 224.

Manuel L. Quezon, President: Broadcast from Washington, D. C., August 9, 1942

Sometimes I have regretted that the Atlantic Charter is so named. Too many persons have fallen into the error of believing that it applies only to those who live beside the Atlantic Ocean

But that is not the fact. In truth, the Atlantic Charter is a world-wide charter. It applies to the nations and peoples of all the world

It is a charter for Europe and for America, for Africa and for Australia, and let us be clear on this — it is a charter of freedom for the peoples of Asia and all the Far East.

[Recalling that a year ago this week President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill met at sea and drew up the charter, Mr. Quezon said that its real test would come after victory was achieved.]

Then we shall be faced with the task of making good on our promise to ourselves

We shall be called upon to make the post-war sacrifices that will take the principles of freedom out of a charter and put them into our everyday lives.

We shall embark on the gigantic task of creating a world without fear and without want, a world where all of us can live in freedom to speak and think and worship, a world where evil men can no longer break the peace.

That is the goal to which we dedicate ourselves, as we recall the signing of the Atlantic Charter. It is a goal which makes sense to Americans as well as to my countrymen on the Islands of the Philippines.

It is the language of the plain people of the Western Hemisphere and of the Eastern — indeed, it is the language, I think, of every one's heart who knows the dignity of man. It is the hope of peace and justice which makes the blood and sorrow of this war worthwhile.

N.Y.T., August 10, 1942, p. 5.

Manuel L. Quezon, President: Broadcast celebrating Rizal Day, December 30, 1942

.

Let us, then, think about the problems that will face us after victory is won. We of the Philippines believe that there is a lesson to be learned from the forty-five years' record of American-Filipino relations. This record stands as a blueprint for those who wonder what should be done for those people who have only the dream of freedom. This record gives

substance to the words burned into the hearts of the world by President Roosevelt's declaration on the Four Freedoms. That declaration, as it stands, is a great document. But it must be put into practice. The record of the Philippines is proof that this can be done.

I believe the Philippines has another unique contribution to make to the cause of the United Nations. Our country has been the meeting-ground of the East and the West. We Filipinos are an Eastern people. We know the minds and the hearts of the great peoples who live in our part of the world. But in the past four centuries we have come to know the Europeans and the Americans on equally intimate terms.

Thus, Filipino civilization represents the merger of East and West. In the Philippines, they have met on an equal footing, and the best of each has intermingled. We have been enriched by this fusion.

Clearly, if we are to establish a world of peace after this war, human beings of all nations must learn to understand and respect one another. The West must try to understand and respect the East, and the East must try to do the same for the West.

We of the Philippines can help by serving as the meeting-ground, as the interpreter between East and West. This will be our contribution to the free world of tomorrow.

.

Release by Office of Special Services, Commonwealth of the Philippines.

ANNEX

FRANCE

A. The French Republic — Pre-Armistice Statements, September 3, 1939 — June 22, 1940

Edouard Daladier, Prime Minister: Broadcast to the French People, September 3, 1939

. . . By standing up against the most horrible of all tyrannies and by making good our word, we are fighting to defend our land, our homes and our liberty.

I have worked without respite against war up to the last minute, and my conscience is clear.

I salute with emotion and affection our young soldiers who are now going to accomplish the sacred duty which we have ourselves carried

out. They can have confidence in their leaders, worthy of those who have already led France to victory

The cause of France is linked with that of justice. It is that of all peaceful and free nations. It will be victorious

Frenchwomen and Frenchmen, we are making war because it has been forced upon us. Each one of us is at his post on the soil of France, in this land of liberty where respect for human dignity finds one of its last refuges.

You will combine all your efforts with a deep feeling of union and brotherhood for the salvation of our country.

The Outbreak of War, p. 21-2.

*Edouard Daladier, Prime Minister: Broadcast from Paris, October 10, 1939*¹

[Translation]

. . . We fight for our land and our homes, but also for a civilization which transcends our frontiers and which has made us what we are: free human beings, dignified, respecting our neighbors, capable of keeping our word, and faithful to the great tradition of Western culture.

Neither France nor Great Britain has entered the war to conduct a kind of ideological crusade. Neither France nor Great Britain has entered the war in a spirit of conquest. They were obliged to fight because Germany wished to impose her domination on Europe. . . .

Certainly it has been and is our constant desire to see the establishment of sincere and loyal cooperation between peoples, but we are resolved never to submit to the dictates of violence.

We have taken up arms against aggression; we shall not lay them down until we have sure guarantees of security — a security which cannot be called in question every six months. . . .

If peace is really wanted — a lasting peace which would give to every home, to every woman and child the joy of living and confidence in the future — it is necessary first of all to appease consciences in revolt, to redress the abuses of force, to satisfy honestly the rights and interests of all peoples. . . .

If peace is really wanted — a lasting peace — it is necessary to understand that the security of nations can only rest on reciprocal guarantees excluding all possibility of surprise and raising a barrier against all attempts at domination.

¹ See also M. Daladier's statement before the Senatorial Commission for Foreign Affairs of the French Parliament (*Le Temps*, October 8, 1939).

If peace is really wanted — a lasting peace — it is necessary to understand, in short, that the time has passed when territorial conquests bring welfare to the conquerors. . . .

I affirm therefore in your name that we are fighting and that we shall go on fighting to obtain a final guarantee of security. . . .

Le Temps, October 12, 1939, p. 1; *The Times*, October 11, 1939, p. 8.

Albert Lebrun, President: Reply to the Peace Proposal of the Queen of the Netherlands and the King of the Belgians,¹ November 12, 1939

. . . No nation is more peace-loving than the French nation. No nation has made greater sacrifices in the cause of European peace. France has already and on frequent occasions made known, and she does so once more today, that she has been and remains determined to welcome every possibility of assuring a just and durable peace for all peoples.

Only a peace founded on justice really endures. France has taken up arms to put a definite end to the methods of violence and force which, for the past two years, in defiance of the most solemn engagements and in violation of the pledged word have already enslaved or destroyed three nations in Europe and today menace the security of all nations. A durable peace therefore can only be established by repairing the injustices which force has imposed on Austria, on Czechoslovakia, and on Poland. Moreover, it can only be established to the extent in which effective guarantees of a political and economic nature assure in the future respect for the liberty of all nations. Mankind will only be delivered from uncertainty and anguish if they are sure that new attacks against justice will henceforward be outlawed.

Any solution which legalized the triumph of injustice would only secure for Europe a precarious truce bearing no relation to the just and stable peace to which your Majesties look forward . . .

The Times, November 13, 1939, p. 6.

Albert Lebrun, President: Speech at Verdun, January 13, 1940²

[Translation]

The battle engaged does not merely aim at rectifying frontiers bearing the mark of past injustices. It has a higher, a wider, a more general aspect.

¹ *B.I.N.*, 1939, XVI, p. 1284.

² See also Broadcast made by Premier Daladier, January 29, 1940 (*Le Temps*, January 31, 1940, p. 2).

The question is to know which will have the last word: freedom or oppression, right or force, justice or violence, spirit or matter, civilization or barbarism, and as freedom, right, justice, spirit, in one word civilization, cannot perish, we, their champions, shall win.

Made wise by an experience which was not altogether a happy one, in agreement with our gallant British Allies and with the other nations engaged in the war and proclaiming the same ideals as we do, we shall lay down the foundations of a just and lasting peace in which the world may at last resume the course of its peaceful destinies

Le Temps, January 14, 1940.

Paul Reynaud, Prime Minister: Broadcast in English to the United States, April 3, 1940

France, you see, France and her empire mean a great many things, and principally a certain way of living. Each man, among us, is free to think as he wishes and to express his opinion out loud. . . .

.

"We must finish with it" has been, from the outset, the formula which summed up all thoughts. And that means no "phoney" peace after a war which is not "phoney" in any respect . . .

France and England are strong, and strong enough to win. We shall use that victory to make little nations safe; they will have their due place beside the big ones. If France is waging the war that Hitler has forced upon her, that is to say war to the bitter end, it is in order to establish, with her ally, peace in Europe, permanent peace.

It is not a question of making another peace treaty this time, but of making a peace . . . and nothing else. Not for twenty-five years, but for our children and our children's children.

We shall do this, to begin with, in the question of disarmament. When Germany has been relieved of these instruments of aggression which she turns out in such quantities and with such frenzy, Europe will be safe and may turn her thoughts to budget modifications. These budgets — Hitler budgets, I should call them — where so many billions that might have been spent for social welfare are swallowed up by armament, will disappear. . . .

As for economic policy, we must return to a sane conception of exchange. I should like to exchange goods with the planet Mars, if I could. For every country its vital space is the whole world. May I remind you, in this regard, that the memorandum handed me by

Mr Sumner Welles, from your President, received the approval of the French Government.¹

Finally, the question arises as to whether it is possible for disarmed nations to establish a federative bond. . .

The conception of peace, on this side of the Maginot Line, is at once realistic and idealistic; we shall forestall the reappearance in Europe of extortion and aggression, and, that done, we shall build an inhabitable dwelling place for all men of good faith. We know what sort of peace Nazi Germany is meditating, on the other side of the Maginot Line: the sinister peace which reigns for the time being in Warsaw and Prague. Such a peace, if it may still be called that, would expose all humanity to an unprecedented danger; it would mean a definite black-out of those Christian principles which the Pope set forth again on Easter Day with such vigor;² it would bring about similarly a black-out of those democratic principles for which your country has stood for more than 150 years. That must not be. Armed to the teeth, and daily a more formidable adversary, we shall act with such energy that there will be no black-out of civilization. The Allied cause, which is the cause of liberty, will triumph. Life will be good and men will be free.

N. Y. T., April 4, 1940.

B. Fighting France

The Free French movement came into existence after Marshal Pétain, as Premier of France, signed an armistice with Germany on June 22, 1940. Denouncing the capitulation and maintaining that there was no independent Government in France, General Charles de Gaulle, former Undersecretary of War, set up a provisional French Committee on June 23, 1940 to direct continuing French resistance.

On July 14, 1942, the name was changed to France Combattante (Fighting France). The British Government and the French National Committee agreed on the following definitions.

Fighting France. A union of French nationals, wherever they may be, and of the French territories who join together in order to collaborate with the United Nations in the war against the common enemies. It will be the symbol of all French nationals who do not accept the capitulation and who by all means at their disposal contribute, wherever they are, to the liberation of France by a common victory of the United Nations.

French National Committee. The directing organ of Fighting France organizes the participation in the war of the French nationals and territories who join

¹ He refers to the memorandum of the conversations between French and United Kingdom representatives with the United States setting out "the essentials of economic foreign policy of United States" For text see *B.I.N.*, 1940, XVII, p. 372, see also release, *D.S.Bul.*, II, p. 434; *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 501.

² *Principles for Peace Selections from Papal Documents, Leo XIII to Pius XII* Edited by Rev. Harry C. Koenig, S.T.D. Washington, Nat. Cath. Welfare Conf., 1943, p. 655.

in collaboration with the United Nations in the war against the common enemies and represents their interests with the Government of the United Kingdom. (*Free France*, July 15, 1942.)

The following French colonies have pledged allegiance to Fighting France:

In Africa: French Equatorial Africa including the French Cameroons, Réunion, Madagascar and French Somaliland.

In Asia: The French settlements in India.

In Oceania: French Oceania including New Caledonia, the Society Islands, the Marquesas Islands, the Wallis and Futuna group and the Franco-British condominium of the New Hebrides.

In the North Atlantic: St. Pierre and Miquelon.

1940

- Jun. 28 The British Government recognized General de Gaulle as "the leader of the group to maintain French resistance." On July 2, 1940, Marshal Pétain established the seat of Government of Unoccupied France in Vichy and drew up a new constitution providing for an authoritarian government. Diplomatic relations with Great Britain were broken off by Marshal Pétain on July 5, following the battle of Oran.
- Aug. 7 Exchange of letters between the British Prime Minister and General de Gaulle concerning the organization, employment and conditions of service of the French volunteer force.¹
- Oct. 27 By two decrees published at Brazzaville, French Equatorial Africa, General de Gaulle outlined his plan of government. A Council of Defense of the French Empire, composed of nine members, was established to serve as a central government to assist General de Gaulle. Local divisions were organized into High Commissariats but retained whatever local autonomy they had enjoyed under the French Empire. General de Gaulle assumed authority over and leadership of French forces resisting the Axis.

1941

- Jan. 5 The Council of Defense recognized by the British Government as the government of all Free French territories.
- " 21 Exchange of notes between the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and General de Gaulle on economic and commercial relations between the United Kingdom and the Cameroons.²
- " 28 Customs union established between French establishments in India and British India.
- Mar. 19 Agreements with United Kingdom on rate of exchange and credits to finance war expenses.
- May 20 Agreement regarding commercial and economic relations between United Kingdom and French Equatorial Africa.
- Jun. 8 Free French troops participate in the occupation of Syria. A civil administration was established for these territories and the Lebanon which are protected by Free French troops.
- Aug. 6 Agreement on commercial and economic relations between Australia and New Caledonia.

¹ U.K., France No. 2 (1940), Cmd. 6220.

² U.K., France No. 1 (1941), Cmd. 6249.

This was superseded on March 18, 1942 by another agreement, Cmd. 6345. Similar agreements were made for French Equatorial Africa on May 20, 1941, Cmd. 6281, superseded on March 18, 1942, Cmd. 6346.

1941

- Aug 15 Exchange of letters affirming the Anglo-French determination to give independence to Syria and the Lebanon though recognizing France's pre-eminent position in them.
- Sept. 24 The Free French National Committee was reorganized and enlarged. Legislative power was assigned to General de Gaulle as President. The Committee serves as a Cabinet and its decisions are carried out by decree of the President. The Council of Defense is maintained as an advisory committee on military affairs. The National Committee has been recognized by the British Government.
- " 26 Recognition by the U.S.S.R.
- Oct 6 Recognition by the Belgian Government-in-Exile
- " 7 Recognition by the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile.
- " 24 Recognition by the Polish Government-in-Exile.
- Dec. 8 The Free French National Committee declared war on Japan.

1942

- May 4 Free French troops participated in the occupation of Madagascar.
- Jul. 9 Appointment of a representative of the United States Government to consult with the Free French National Committee in London.
- " 14 The name of the *Free French movement* changed to *Fighting France* (La France Combattante).
- Sept. 3 Exchange of notes with the United States on reciprocal lend-lease aid ¹
- " 28 The Soviet Government recognized the French National Committee as exclusively "qualified to organize the participation in the war of French citizens and territories and to represent in respect to the government of the U.S.S.R. French interests, especially as they are affected by the pursuit of the war."
- " 29 General de Gaulle denounced the Munich agreement.
- Oct. 20 The offices of Foreign Affairs and Colonies were merged in a single Commissariat.
- Dec. 1 The Mexican Government recognized the French National Committee.
- " 14 Agreement with the United Kingdom turning over control of Madagascar to the Fighting French.

Maurice Dejean, National Commissioner for Foreign Affairs: Lecture at Caxton Hall, London, April 15, 1941

... That is precisely our aim: to merge free France into liberated France. That is what we are working and fighting for at your side. It is our reason for trying to enlist in our ranks the greatest possible number of our compatriots. We are convinced that when Germany is beaten, when the enemy has been driven from our soil, Frenchmen will know how to rebuild their house and put it in order. They will be able to establish a just balance between restored internal liberties and the authority necessary for their maintenance. If those who today form

¹ U. S. Executive Agreement Series No. 273. Prior to this, Great Britain had released certain of American lend-lease supplies to the Fighting French but there had been no direct aid from the United States.

General de Gaulle's entourage happen to have any influence in the France of tomorrow, they will use it above all to maintain close solidarity between our country and the great Western Democracies. For such a policy is dictated, not alone for us by gratitude to the nations which make it possible for us to continue the struggle, but also — and above all — by the profound conviction that a lasting peace must not be the crystallization of a given military and diplomatic situation, but a continual creation of the great nations which strive towards freedom and progress.

Free France Its Leaders — its Nature — its Aims, issued by the Free France Information Service, Ottawa, 1941.

General Charles de Gaulle, President of the French National Committee: Broadcast,¹ London, June 8, 1941

People of Syria and the Lebanon! At this moment when the forces of Free France, united to the forces of the British Empire, our ally, are entering your territory, I declare that I assume the powers, responsibilities, and duties of the representative of "La France au Levant." I do this in the name of Free France, which identifies herself with the traditional and real France, and in the name of her chief, General de Gaulle. In this capacity I come to put an end to the mandatory regime and to proclaim you free and independent.

You will therefore henceforward be sovereign and independent peoples, and you will be able either to form yourselves into separate States or to unite into a single State. In either event, your independent and sovereign status will be guaranteed by a treaty in which our mutual relations will be defined. This treaty will be negotiated as soon as possible between your representatives and myself. Pending its conclusion, our mutual position will be one of close unity in pursuit of a common ideal and common aims.

People of Syria and the Lebanon, you will see from this declaration that if the Free France and the British Forces have crossed your frontier, it is not to take away your liberty; it is to insure it. It is to drive out of Syria the forces of Hitler. It is to prevent the Levant from becoming an enemy base directed against the British and against ourselves.

The Free French Press and Information Service, N. Y.

¹ Made on the occasion of the entrance of Free French, Belgian, British, British Imperial and Allied troops into Syria and the Lebanon.

*General Georges Catroux, Free French High Commissioner in the Middle East: Declaration to the People of Syria and the Lebanon, June 8, 1941*¹

I come to put an end to the mandatory regime and to proclaim you free and independent. You will be henceforward sovereign separate States, or able to unite into a single State. Your independent and sovereign status will be guaranteed by a Treaty in which our mutual relations will be defined. Pending its conclusion, our mutual position will be one of close unity in pursuit of a common ideal and common aims. If the Free French and British forces across your frontier, it is not to take away your liberty, it is to ensure it. It is to drive out of Syria the forces of Hitler, to prevent the Levant from becoming an enemy base directed against the British and ourselves . . . If you rally to us, the British Government in agreement with Free France has promised to grant you all the advantages enjoyed by the free countries associated with them. Thus the blockade will be lifted and you will enter into immediate relations with the sterling bloc, which will open up the widest possibilities to your imports and exports. You will be able to buy and sell freely with all the free countries. A great hour in your history has sounded. France declares you independent by the voice of your sons who are fighting for her life and for the liberty of the world.

Australia, *C.N.I.A.*, XI, No. 8, p. 211.

Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. René Cassin, National Commissioner for Justice and Public Education: Speech on Adoption of the Resolution, June 12, 1941

[Translation]

As the representative of General de Gaulle, Leader of the Free French, I have the honor to make the following statement: After hard-fought battles, the French nation has been captive for almost a year. It has been reduced to helplessness and condemned to silence. The French forces, however, which incarnate the hopes of liberation of our nation, are taking part in increasing numbers and strength, in the fight against our common enemies on land, on sea and in the air.

¹ Made on the day Free French and British Imperial troops entered these territories to prevent them from falling under German control.

On the same day General Catroux was appointed Commander-in-Chief in Syria with full powers by General de Gaulle. On September 16, 1941, a Government was established for Syria. On November 26, a Government was established for the Lebanon. Both have been recognized by the British Government.

France came into the war to fight against the aggressor of her Ally, Poland. She remains faithful to the alliance freely entered into with the United Kingdom, with the British Empire, with the peoples of the British Commonwealth of Nations. She also remains closely united to the other nations whose emancipation she championed and whose development she promoted, as well as to all the victims of German imperialism, whose terrible trials she now shares.

France repudiates the monstrous "New European Order" which it is sought to impose upon her, and in which she would play the part of her executioners' accomplice. She cannot think of peace without liberty. The French people and the populations of the French Empire will continue the struggle until the complete victory has been won by the democracies over Germany and her associates.

We mean to cooperate in building up a world which will be safe from all menace of aggression and which will offer economic and social security to all. That is the reason why, in the name of General de Gaulle, we adhere wholeheartedly to the spirit and letter of the draft Resolution which is now before us. This is why we want to express our admiration and gratitude to the British people and to its Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill, who is leading with such great energy the struggle of free peoples against tyranny.

At a time when the Germans are attempting to create a New Order for the profit only of a single race, a single nation and one man, against the desire, against the interests of all other peoples, I should like to recall the words of Abraham Lincoln, and to suggest that the new international order which we wish to create should be one of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

U. K., Cmd. 6285 Misc. No. I (1941), p. 12;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 5, p. 2-3.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. René Cassin, National Commissioner for Justice and Public Education: Speech on Adoption of the First Resolution (Atlantic Charter), September 24, 1941*¹

[Translation]

General de Gaulle, leader of the Free French, is glad of this opportunity to approve, together with the heads of the Allied Governments, the resolution proposed by His Majesty's Government. At a time when the French people are stirred by a tremendous determination to resist tyranny, the Free French are certain of being their faithful interpreters

¹ See section United Nations, p. 3.

in adhering to the declaration formulated by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain in the name of the two great American and British peoples. This declaration of common principles by the Allies is most opportune. The whole world is thus in a position to estimate the irreconcilable opposition which exists between the "New Order," which Hitler seeks to bring about by brute force, and the essential principles of a true human order such as the great Republic of the United States, or as the Allies conceive it and are striving to make it a reality. If an attempt of this kind has failed after a war which began nearly thirty years ago, is it not primarily because the intervening period was nothing more than a truce during which Germany, while inciting other countries to insensate desires, thought only of revenge? Hitler has merely revived, in a more monstrous and brutal form, William II's dream of world domination.

France, which came into the present war without seeking any aggrandizement, whether territorial or otherwise, intends that, in conformity with the desire expressed in the name of Great Britain and the United States of America, the right of peoples to self-determination, so cruelly violated for years past by the Axis Powers, shall be restored in its various aspects: external independence and freedom to choose the form of government in harmony with the general interest, while also taking into account the duty incumbent upon civilized nations to protect the less advanced peoples and promote their development.

Invaded three times in less than a century by an adversary bent on death and destruction, France can see no safeguard for this independence and freedom, or for that of maritime communications, outside the framework of an effective organization of international security, an essential element of which is preliminary disarmament, the destruction of the military machine, and the limitation of war potentialities in countries which have never ceased to threaten her and are still liable to do so. The French also consider as necessary to the establishment of a real peace the practical ratification of the essential liberties of man and the concerted utilization, in view of the economic and social securities of peoples, of technical progress creative of fresh wealth.

The time has not yet come when the guiding principles laid down in the joint declaration made by President Roosevelt and Mr. Winston Churchill can find expression in legal agreements and concrete application. That is why General de Gaulle shares Mr. Churchill's view that it would be vain to raise questions of interpretation now, when their nature and scope would be difficult to determine. He believes that, once the French nation has been set free, its representatives will be in

a position, like other interested parties, to stress their point of view as regards the necessity to avoid any incentive to aggression, insure the righting of wrongs committed, and obtain effective guarantees of security, while taking the past into account. In order to achieve the great results envisaged here, all French people who are free again will be ready to collaborate with the other nations of the world. Indeed, when peace has come, constant respect for the law of solidarity will impose itself on all. In the future, it alone will enable us to avoid a repetition of those catastrophes which rend the unity of the human race.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 11-12;
I-A.R., 1941, II, 9, p. 4-5.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London. René Cassin, National Commissioner of Justice and Public Education: Speech on Adoption of the Second Resolution (Post-war Economic Needs of Europe), September 24, 1941*¹

[Translation]

The representatives of General de Gaulle fully adhere to the draft resolution proposed by His Majesty's Government and wish to thank His Majesty's Government for the initiative they were good enough to take which represents in our view a first application of the fifth point of the Atlantic Charter.

Whatever we may wish to do, it is not possible for us to provide an immediate and comprehensive remedy which would relieve the atrocious conditions of the oppressed peoples of Europe. But, after they have been set free, their sufferings must not be prolonged any more than is strictly necessary. That is why the French delegation associates itself so gratefully with the plan whose broad lines have been set forth by His Majesty's Government, it being understood that a priority is being envisaged in favor of those countries which have most suffered through occupation.

In the course of our preparatory work, we must therefore answer four kinds of questions: 1. We must draw up the list and the sum total of our requirements in order to facilitate our research. With regard to France, I can already indicate the commodities for which we would ask priority: condensed milk, and medicine and vitamins for children. 2. The second question concerns buying, in the best possible conditions, and the financing of stocks of produce corresponding to our needs. 3. We must remember the capital problem of the transport of these foodstuffs and raw materials to France. After the war, for a given

¹ See section United Nations, p. 4.

period, the available tonnage should undoubtedly be placed in an inter-Allied pool. Our mercantile marine service has studied the question and will be in a position to make a definite proposal in this respect. 4. Finally, the problem of the distribution of foodstuffs and raw materials inside the beneficiary country will have to be solved.

I wish also to associate myself with the desire expressed by our British friends to see the United States Government collaborate in the proposed plan. I do not know in what form the Washington Government could participate in work, the humanitarian nature of which is so much in keeping with the traditions of the American people. I suggest that a delegate of the American Red Cross, that admirable institution whose members have in recent months devoted themselves so unselfishly to relieving the distress of our compatriots, should be invited to take part in our work as an adviser or observer.

Lastly, it seems to me useful to insist on the necessity of giving the greatest publicity to the inter-Allied initiative. It is imperative that our brothers who are held prisoners should know that at the end of the long tunnel of darkness and anguish in which they are confined, there shines the hope of a better day.

U. K., Cmd. 6315, Misc. No. 3 (1941), p. 24-5;
I-A.R., 1941, I, 9, p. 9.

Allied Declaration on German War Crimes, London, January 13, 1942

[For text see United Nations, p 7]

***General Charles de Gaulle, President of the French National Committee:
Statement on "War Aims and Post-war Aims," June 23, 1942***

. . . We want France to recover everything that belongs to her. For us the end of the war means restoration both of complete integrity to our home country, the Empire and the French heritage, and of the nation's absolute sovereignty over her own destinies.

Any attempt at usurpation, whether from inside or outside, must be crushed and wiped out.

As we mean to make France once again sole mistress in her own house, so shall we see to it that the French people be their own and sole masters. When they have been freed from enemy oppression all their liberties must be restored to them.

Once the enemy is driven from their land, all Frenchmen and women will elect a National Assembly which will decide in full exercise of its sovereignty what course the future of the country shall take.

We want retribution for every threat which has been or may be aimed

at French rights, interests and honor, and such threats must cease completely. This means, firstly, that enemy leaders who violate the laws of war to the detriment of French persons and properties, together with traitors cooperating with them, must be punished.

It also means the totalitarian system which roused, armed and incited our enemies against us, as well as the systematic coalition of private interests which in France has acted in opposition to national interests, must once and for all be overthrown

We want all Frenchmen to be able to live in security. In the sphere of external policy we must obtain material guarantees which will render France's traditional invader incapable of further aggression and oppression. At home practical guarantees must be worked out to put an end to tyranny constituted by perpetual infringement of rights and to insure liberty and dignity in work and life to every citizen. For us, national and social security are imperative, inseparable aims.

We want to destroy forever the mechanical organization of mankind such as the enemy have achieved in contempt of all religion, morals and charity simply because they were strong enough to override others. And, moreover, in a powerful rebirth of the resources of the nation and the empire, inspired by methodical technique, we want the age-old French ideal of liberty, equality and fraternity henceforth to be applied to our land in order that every individual may be free in thoughts, beliefs and actions, that at the outset all may have equal opportunities in their social life, and that every man be respected by his fellows and helped if in need.

We want this war, which similarly affects the destiny of all peoples and has united the democracies in one and the same effort, to result in a world organization establishing lasting solidarity and mutual help between nations in every sphere. And we intend in this international organization that France shall take the eminent position to which her genius and achievements entitle her.

France and the world struggle and suffer for freedom, justice and the right of the individual to self-determination. This right of the individual to self-determination, this justice and freedom, must win the war in fact and in law to benefit every man, every state.

Only such a victory for France and humanity can compensate our country for the unparalleled trials she is undergoing and once again open for her the road to greatness.

Such a victory is worth every effort, every sacrifice.

We shall win.

Adrien Tixier, Chief of the Delegation of the Free French National Committee in the United States: Speech at a Mass Meeting of France Forever and of the Central Committee of French-Speaking Societies, New York, July 14, 1942

... The Free French do not fight merely for the material liberation of the territory of France and of her Empire. They are fighting to restore to the French people their sovereignty and lost liberties. General de Gaulle and the French National Committee reject the parody of constitutional reform carried out at Vichy and the totalitarian political regime resulting therefrom. They reject likewise Vichy's policy of collaboration with the Axis. They are sure that this policy could end only in the permanent enslavement of France.

... The French National Committee and General de Gaulle do not at present consider themselves, and have no intention of imposing themselves after the war, as the legal Government of France. They declare themselves, for the present and for the future, deeply respectful of the sovereignty of the French people, who are alone qualified to elect their representatives when they are again free. Very recently, General de Gaulle personally declared himself in favor of the election, by universal suffrage, of a Constituent Assembly which, after the liberation of France, will have the task of determining the future political, economic, and social regime of our country.

... This viewpoint of General de Gaulle is in perfect harmony with that of the French people who are resisting. . . .

... What are the aims of the organizations of French internal resistance? Exactly the same as those of the Free French fighting units. As do General de Gaulle and the French National Committee, the organizations of resistance want to chase out the invader, to free the French territory, to eject the Vichy regime and to restore their liberty to the French people. In reality, they constitute the first fighters of the second front, which already exists and which has its dead, its wounded, its prisoners.

The organizations of resistance are not political parties and have no intention of becoming such. However, it is interesting to note that several months ago, the organizations "Liberation," "Liberation Française," and "Franc-Tireur" created a committee for coordinating their activities. . . . These three organizations of resistance have established direct contact with General de Gaulle. Conversations which lasted about two months ended in an agreement which was published in the underground newspapers towards the middle of June and published in

London at the end of June. From now on, unity is realized between internal and external resistance, and General de Gaulle has been chosen as Chief by the three most important organizations of French internal resistance. The Committees of Socialist Action of Occupied France have likewise proclaimed their support of Free France and of General de Gaulle.

The agreement thus realized between external and internal French resistance is of capital importance. It demonstrates the formation among the French people of a new national unity forged in suffering. Before the governments and peoples of the United Nations it strengthens the position of Free France which represents from now on not only the Frenchmen who are fighting outside, but also the large organizations which are arousing and directing the resistance of the French people, who wish to share in the war and in the victory.

Free France, 1942, II, 2, p. 42.

General Charles de Gaulle: Letter to Msgr. Jan Šrámek, Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, concerning the Munich Agreement, London, September 29, 1942

. . . I have the honor to inform the Czechoslovak Government that the French National Committee, certain of expressing the feelings of the French nation, an ally and friend of Czechoslovakia, convinced that the present world crisis cannot but deepen the friendship and alliance between the French Nation and the Czechoslovak Nation who, united by the same destiny, are now experiencing a period of joint suffering and hope, faithful to France's traditional policy, declare that notwithstanding regrettable events and misunderstandings in the past, one of the basic aims of their policy is that a Franco-Czechoslovak alliance should emerge from the terrible ordeal of the present world crisis strengthened and secured for the future. In this spirit the French National Committee, rejecting the agreements signed in Munich on September 29, 1938, solemnly declare that they consider these agreements as null and void as also all acts accomplished in the application or in consequence of these same agreements. Recognizing no territorial alterations affecting Czechoslovakia supervening in 1938 or since that time, they undertake to do everything in their power to ensure that the Czechoslovak Republic within frontiers prior to September 1938, obtains all effective guarantees for her military and economic security, her territorial integrity and her political unity.

I-A.R., 1942, II, p. 248.

*André Philip, National Commissioner for the Interior and Labor:
Broadcast over the British Broadcasting Corporation, December
30, 1942*¹

In a communiqué of November 16, 1942 the National Committee had made known that it took no share and assumed no responsibility in the negotiations entered upon in North Africa with the Vichy delegates. Since then, you have no longer heard Fighting France's spokesman on the radio. Due to the situation in North Africa we were indeed faced with either the abandonment of the moral and legal principles which we deem essential or the utterance of criticisms which, broadcast from a radio station of a country which gives us hospitality, could have appeared untimely.

The situation has changed and is altered today. It is a fact that at present possibilities of collaboration and eventually of unification are open between all the authentic elements of French resistance. Therefore, we are resuming our broadcasts and you will again hear every day either the National Commissioners or the spokesman of Fighting France.

On this occasion I should like to specify the essential principles which guide our action. First: The Allied landings in North Africa open a new page in our country's history. For two years, under the inspiration and leadership of General de Gaulle we, Fighting Frenchmen from within and without France, have carried on the struggle. Colonial territories have rallied to us and have shared in the war effort. Roads have been opened, airdromes laid out, our fleet has spanned the seas, an army has been raised which has reaped glorious laurels at Cheren, Massaouah, at Bir Hacheim, at El Alamein and part of which is at present taking part in the pursuit of Rommel, while General LeClerc's troops are operating in the desert. Today North Africa joins us in the military effort. She brings to it immense economic resources, fresh troops with a noble tradition of heroism and of military glory. The French Empire can consider itself reconstituted today, and thanks to it France is in a position to play a very outstanding role in the Mediterranean war. We now have an opportunity to resume our role in the world and we can proclaim that none of the glory of our country has been lost.

Second: This participation in the Inter-Allied war effort belongs to France. General de Gaulle and General Giraud are not feudal chieftains each contributing territories belonging to him, troops which would

¹ See also General de Gaulle's broadcast, December 28, 1942 (*Free France*, III, 1943, p. 12).

be faithful to him personally. They are, we are all, servants of the French nation alone. It is not the Nation's responsibility to unite behind its army, but it is the responsibility of the army, the navy, the colonies, of all civil and military administrations to place themselves everywhere at the service of the Nation, of the Republic, one and indivisible. Therefore, we are trying to realize between these elements of authentic resistance not only a close collaboration but a true unification. There must be a single French army, even if its elements act on separate fields of operations. There must be a single common administration of the different metropolitan and colonial territories which have been liberated or which have united. There must be a single organism which will manage temporarily French interests through great military and diplomatic problems, and will let the voice of the Mother Country be heard in the United Nations conferences.

Third: This unification must be made on the single legal base possible — that of republican legitimacy. The French Republic entered the war voluntarily. The Vichy *coup d'état* achieved under enemy pressure with one stroke put the French people out of the war and out of the Republic. Today it must be restored to both: the liberation of the land and that of the human beings must be realized together. In tomorrow's free France there will doubtless be constitutional modifications. They will be carried out by the government which the French people in their sovereignty will have chosen. In the meanwhile, the essential values of our civilization must be preserved and saved. Republican principles must be solemnly reaffirmed and in all the liberated territories republican legislation and institutions must be re-established.

Fourth: This unification must be made between resisting Frenchmen. This excludes men who have collaborated with the enemy, adopted his ideology and who are today attempting or will tomorrow attempt to save their positions by flying to the aid of Victory, their admission will cause the cruelest disillusion and weaken the Allied war effort. Unification must be made among true patriots, among all those who, whatever their political and social origin, have and have had only one care, one preoccupation: to assure France's return to the war for the liberation of her territories and the restoration of her lost liberties.

Free France, III, 1943, p. 13.

VII. THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

1. CONFERENCES

On December 26, 1933, the Seventh International Conference of American States, Montevideo, adopted a Convention on Rights and Duties of States which condemned the intervention of any State in the internal affairs of another.

On December 23, 1936, at Buenos Aires, the Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Re-establishment of Peace provided for consultations in "the event that the peace of the American Republics is menaced, and in order to coordinate efforts to prevent war."

In the Declaration of the Principles of Solidarity of America, approved on December 24, 1938, the Eighth International Conference of American States, held at Lima, enlarged and reinforced the Buenos Aires agreements and declared that the Foreign Ministers should meet to deal with emergencies as they arose.

1939

Sept. 23-Oct. 3 First Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, Panama City.¹ The Final Act of October 3, 1939, included a general declaration of neutrality, known as the Declaration of Panama (Res. XIV), which defined a safety zone around the Americas from which belligerent activity should be barred. It was provided that there should be further consultation if attempts were made to transfer the sovereignty of a geographic region of the Americas from one non-American State to another.

1940

Jul. 21-30 Second Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, Havana.² Act of Havana concerning the Provisional Administration of European Colonies and Possessions in the Americas, July 30, 1940 (Final Act, Res. XX) and Convention signed July 30, 1940. Resolutions were adopted on neutrality, protection of the peace of the Western Hemisphere and economic cooperation.

1942

Jan. 8 Convention on Provisional Administration of European Colonies and Possessions in the Americas, July 30, 1940, entered into force.³

" 15-28 Third Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, Rio de Janeiro. A joint recommendation was passed that diplomatic relations be severed with Japan, Germany and Italy and that commercial and financial intercourse be terminated.

¹ See *D.A.F.R.*, II, p. 99-119.

² See *ibid.*, p. 93 for text of Act; III, p. 63-94.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 85 and IV, p. 332.

1942

Mar. 30	Inter-American Defense Board established at Washington. ¹
Apr. 6	Inter-American Commission for Territorial Administration set up.
Jun. 30	Inter-American Conference on Systems of Economic and Financial Control, Washington.
Sept. 7-18	Eleventh Pan American Sanitary Conference, Rio de Janeiro. Resolutions emphasized relationship of continental defense and public health.
" 10-16	Inter-American Congress on Social Planning, Santiago, Chile.
Nov. 2	Report of the Executive Committee of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union on Post-war Planning.

Second Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, Resolutions and Recommendations, Havana, July 21-30, 1940

XVI. MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND UNION AMONG THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The Second Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics

.

Declares:

.

Four. That they reaffirm their strong desire to avoid the use of force in this continent as a means of solving differences between nations and, therefore, to resort exclusively to juridical and pacific methods;

Five. That they consider it essential to extend the sphere of action of these methods, so that in all cases they may be decisively effective for the preservation of peace;

Six. That they will, likewise, make every effort to the end that these principles and aspirations may be adopted in the relations between the nations of America and those of other continents;

.

Eight. That they vehemently desire that peace be established on bases which will be lasting and inspired by the common welfare of all peoples;

¹ See Recommendation XXXIX of the Third Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, Rio de Janeiro, January 1942 (*D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 305). Supplementing the work of this Continental Board are several bilateral commissions.

Nine. That they are disposed to maintain international relations on juridical bases resting on the solid foundation of moral forces, in order to re-establish definitely the bonds of human community; and

Ten That, faithful to their ideals, they will coordinate their own interests with the duties of universal cooperation.

XX. ACT OF HAVANA CONCERNING THE PROVISIONAL ADMINISTRATION
OF EUROPEAN COLONIES AND POSSESSIONS IN THE AMERICAS

.

The Second Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics

Declares:

That when islands or regions in the Americas now under the possession of non-American nations are in danger of becoming the subject of barter of territory or change of sovereignty, the American nations, taking into account the imperative need of continental security and the desires of the inhabitants of the said islands or regions, may set up a regime of provisional administration under the following conditions:

(a) That as soon as the reasons requiring this measure shall cease to exist, and in the event that it would not be prejudicial to the safety of the American Republics, such territories shall, in accordance with the principle reaffirmed by this declaration that peoples of this continent have the right freely to determine their own destinies, be organized as autonomous states if it shall appear that they are able to constitute and maintain themselves in such condition, or be restored to their previous status, whichever of these alternatives shall appear the more practicable and just;

(b) That the regions to which this declaration refers shall be placed temporarily under the provisional administration of the American Republics, and this administration shall be exercised with the twofold purpose of contributing to the security and defense of the continent, and to the economic, political, and social progress of such regions. . . .

.

CONVENTION ON THE PROVISIONAL ADMINISTRATION OF EUROPEAN
COLONIES AND POSSESSIONS IN THE AMERICAS, JULY 30, 1940

.

I. If a non-American State shall directly or indirectly attempt to replace another non-American State in the sovereignty or control which

it exercises over any territory located in the Americas, thus threatening the peace of the continent, such territory shall automatically come under the provisions of this convention and shall be submitted to a provisional administrative regime.

II. The administration shall be exercised, as may be considered advisable in each case, by one or more American States, with their previous approval.

III. When the administration shall have been established for any region it shall be exercised in the interest of the security of the Americas and for the benefit of the region under administration, with a view to its welfare and progress, until such time as the region is in a position to govern itself or is restored to its former status, whenever the latter is compatible with the security of the American Republics.

IV. The administration of the region shall be exercised under conditions which shall guarantee freedom of conscience and of worship, subject to the regulations which public order and good habits may demand.

V. The administration shall enforce the local laws coordinating them with the purposes of this convention, but it may furthermore adopt such measures as may be necessary to meet situations in which such laws do not exist.

VI. In all that concerns commerce and industry, the American nations shall enjoy the same situation and benefits, and the administrator is forbidden to establish a privileged position for itself or its nationals or for certain states. Open economic relations shall be maintained with all countries on a reciprocity basis.

VII. Natives of the region shall participate, as citizens, in public administration and in the courts of justice without further qualification than their capacity so to do.

VIII. To the extent that it may be practicable, rights of every sort shall be governed by local law and custom, and vested rights shall be protected in accordance with such law.

IX. Forced labor shall be abolished in the regions where it exists.

X. The administration shall provide facilities for education of all kinds with the twofold purpose of developing the wealth of the region and improving the living conditions of the population, especially as regards public and individual hygiene and preparation for the exercise of political autonomy as soon as possible.

XI. The natives of a region under administration shall have their own Organic Act which the administration shall establish, consulting the people in whatever manner is possible.

XII. The administration shall submit an annual report to the inter-American organization entrusted with the control of the regions under administration, of the manner in which it has fulfilled its functions, attaching thereto copies of its accounts and of the measures adopted in the region during the year.

XIII. The organization referred to in the preceding article shall be competent to take cognizance of the petitions submitted by inhabitants of the region through the medium of the administration, with reference to the exercise of the provisional administration. The administration shall transmit, with this petition, such observations as it may deem proper.

XIV. The first administration shall be granted for a period of three years; at the end of this period, if necessary, it shall be renewed for successive periods not longer than ten years.

XV. The expenses incurred in the exercise of the administration shall be defrayed with the revenues of the region under administration but in case they are insufficient the deficit shall be met by the State or States which act as administrators.

XVI. A commission to be known as the "Inter-American Commission for Territorial Administration" is hereby established, to be composed of a representative from each one of the States which ratifies this convention; it shall be the international organization to which this convention refers. Once this convention has become effective, any country which ratifies it may convoke the first meeting proposing the city in which it is to be held. The Commission shall elect its chairman, complete its organization and fix its definitive seat. Two-thirds of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum and two-thirds of the members present may adopt decisions.

XVII. The Commission is authorized to establish a provisional administration in the regions to which the present convention refers; allow such administration to be exercised by the number of States which it may determine in each case, and supervise its exercise under the terms of the preceding articles.

XVIII. None of the provisions contained in the present convention refers to territories or possessions which are the subject of dispute or claims between European powers and one or more of the Republics of the Americas. . . .

Report of the Secretary of State, Second Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, Havana, 1940, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1941, p. 72-3, 75-6, 84-8; D.A.F.R., III, p. 63-89.

*Third Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics:
Final Act, Rio de Janeiro, January 15-28, 1942*

RESOLUTION II: PRODUCTION OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

WHEREAS:

1. Continental solidarity must be translated into positive and efficient action of the highest significance, which action can be no other than an economic mobilization of the American Republics capable of rapidly and fully guaranteeing the supply of strategic and basic materials necessary to the defense of the Hemisphere;

2. This mobilization should include all activities which will advance the desired end, and must have the preferential character which its nature and purpose require;

3. In order to insure the smooth carrying out of the suggested plan, every positive action must be taken; all existing obstacles or those which may in the future appear should be eliminated or minimized; and all contributory factors should be strengthened;

4. Commercial speculation should be prevented from taking unfair advantage of the situation;

5. Guarantees should be given for the continuance of long-term contracts and for the maintenance of prices, equitable both for the consumer and profitable to the producer, to permit the attainment and maintenance of a fair wage level;

6. Consideration must be given to measures providing for transition to the post-war period and the resulting readjustment with a minimum of disturbance to production and commerce; taking steps to protect, at the opportune time, producers against competition from goods produced in countries with a low standard of living;

7. Credit operations should have, as far as possible, an economic character, and should take into account the real ability of the debtors to repay;

8. There should exist in each country of the Americas special organizations to formulate promptly the respective national plans for economic mobilization;

9. A Pan American organization should formulate coordinated general plans of mobilization on the basis of the national plans above indicated; and

10. The Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee can efficiently carry out these functions if its authority and powers are enlarged,

The Third Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics

Recommends:

1. That, as a practical expression of continental solidarity, an economic mobilization of the American Republics be effected, with a view to assuring to the countries of this Hemisphere, and particularly to those at war, an adequate supply of basic and strategic materials in the shortest possible time.

2. That such mobilization include mining, agriculture, industrial, and commercial activities related to the supply not only of materials for strictly military use, but also of products essential for civilian needs.

3. That full recognition be given to the imperative character and extreme urgency of the existing situation when formulating measures necessary to effect economic mobilization.

4. That the mobilization include measures to stimulate production and other measures designed to eliminate or minimize administrative formalities and the regulations and restrictions which impede the production and free flow of basic and strategic materials.

5. That, in addition, measures be adopted to strengthen the finances of the producing countries.

6. That the American nations take measures to prevent commercial speculation from increasing export prices of basic and strategic products above the limits fixed for the respective domestic markets. .

7. That, in so far as possible, the increase of production be assured by bilateral or multilateral agreements or contracts which provide for purchases during long periods at prices which are equitable for the consumer, remunerative to the producer and which provide a fair standard of wages for the workers of the Americas in which producers are protected against competition from products originating in areas wherein real wages are unduly low; and which make provision for the period of transition after the war and readjustments which will follow in a manner guaranteeing the continuance of adequate production and permitting the existence of trade under conditions equitable to producers.

8. That the service of financial obligations incurred to maintain and stimulate production in each country be made conditional, in so far as possible, upon the proceeds of its exports.

9. That the American nations which do not possess appropriate agencies organize special commissions prior to April 30, 1942, to formulate national plans for economic mobilization.

10. That the said commissions provide the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee with the necessary material so that it may formulate a coordinated general plan for economic mobilization.

11. That the Inter-American Financial and Economic Committee be further charged with preparing a list, to be periodically revised, of the

basic and strategic materials considered by each country as necessary for the defense of the Hemisphere; and

Resolves:

12. That, in order to enable the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee to carry out the new duties entrusted to it, its means of operation be expanded immediately, and that it be empowered to request the American Governments to execute the inter-American economic agreements which they have previously approved.

RESOLUTION XXV: POST-WAR PROBLEMS

WHEREAS:

1. World peace must be based on the principles of respect for law, of justice and of cooperation which inspire the Nations of America and which have been expressed at Inter-American Meetings held from 1889 to date;

2. A new order of peace must be supported by economic principles which will insure equitable and lasting international trade with equal opportunities for all nations;

3. Collective security must be founded not only on political institutions but also on just, effective and liberal economic systems;

4. It is indispensable to undertake the immediate study of the basis for this new economic and political order; and

5. It is an imperative necessity for the countries of America to increase their productive capacity; to secure, from their international trade, returns which will permit them adequately to remunerate labor and improve the standard of living of workers; to protect and preserve the health of their peoples and develop their civilization and culture.

The Third Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics

Resolves:

1. To request the Governing Board of the Pan American Union to convoke an Inter-American Technical Economic Conference charged with the study of present and post-war economic problems.

2. To entrust the Inter-American Juridical Committee with the formulation of specific recommendations relative to the international organization in the juridical and political fields, and in the field of international security.

3. To entrust the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee with a similar function in the economic field, to make the necessary preparations for the Inter-American Technical Economic Conference, referred to in the first paragraph of this Resolution.

4. To request the Pan American Union to appoint an Executive Committee to receive such projects as the American nations may present, and to submit said projects, respectively, to the Inter-American Juridical Committee and to the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee.

5 To request the Pan American Union to direct this Executive Committee to submit the recommendations of the Inter-American Juridical Committee to the Governments of the American Republics so that the conclusions reached may be adopted at a subsequent meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

6. To request the Pan American Union to determine, in agreement with the Governments of the American Republics, the date and place of meeting of the Inter-American Technical Economic Conference, referred to in the first paragraph of this Resolution.

RESOLUTION XXXV. SUPPORT AND ADHERENCE TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE "ATLANTIC CHARTER"

The Third Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics

Resolves:

To take note of the contents of the "Atlantic Charter" and to express to the President of the United States of America its satisfaction with the inclusion in that document of principles which constitute a part of the juridical heritage of America in accordance with the Convention on Rights and Duties of States approved at the Seventh International Conference of American States, held at Montevideo in 1933¹. . .

Congress and Conference Series No. 36, Pan American Union, Washington, 1942; *D.S. Bul.*, VI, p. 117-44; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 290.

Inter-American Juridical Committee: Preliminary Recommendation on Post-War Problems, September 5, 1942

CONCLUSIONS

The Inter-American Juridical Committee, taking into account the facts above set forth, indicating what the Committee believes to be the main causes of the breakdown of international law and order, and believing it necessary to make its contribution to the determination of the general principles upon which law and order should be based in the future, to the end that a just and permanent peace may be established

¹ *Treaties, Conventions . . . between the United States and Other Powers, 1923-1937*, IV, p. 4807.

586 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS
among the nations, proposes to the Governments of the American Republics the following conclusions:

I. PRIORITY OF THE MORAL LAW AND OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW DERIVED FROM IT

Nations must recognize in their mutual relations the priority of the moral law, which is the same for nations as for individuals; and they must make their conduct conform to the fundamental principles derived from that law.

Existing rules of positive law must not be regarded as fixing permanently the *status quo*, but rather as the necessary basis of international order and stability pending the adoption of rules more in accord with the new needs of the international community.

II. REPUDIATION OF THE USE OF FORCE

War must be repudiated not only as an instrument of national policy, but also as a legalized procedure for the settlement of disputes.

The community of nations, acting through its organized agents, must alone have the right to use force to prevent or resist aggression and to maintain order and respect for law.

Resistance by a nation to aggression must be limited to the defense of its territory pending effective action by the community of nations.

The acts which shall be regarded as constituting aggression must be specifically defined, as well as the conditions calling into effect the right of legitimate self-defense.

III. UNQUALIFIED OBLIGATION TO SETTLE DISPUTES BY PEACEFUL METHODS

Nations must undertake an unqualified obligation to settle their disputes by peaceful methods.

The various procedures for the peaceful settlement of international disputes must be organized in such a way as to operate automatically and progressively until a final and definitive solution of the controversy has been obtained by means of one or other of the several procedures laid down, or by means of some alternative procedure which the parties in controversy may agree to adopt.

The existing procedures of conciliation and arbitration should be reorganized so as to make them more readily and more promptly accessible.

The jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice

should be extended, and procedure before the Court should be coordinated with that of regional judicial tribunals, if any should be created; the jurisdiction of these regional tribunals being determined by the place and the subject matter of the controversy.

IV. SOLIDARITY IN THE PRESENCE OF AGGRESSION

Nations have a common and joint obligation to watch over the observance of the fundamental principles of international law, and they must assume a collective responsibility for the maintenance of peace and order.

An act of aggression committed against one nation must be considered as an act of aggression against all the other members of the international community.

When once the aggressor has been determined by the competent organs of the international community, nations shall have no right to remain neutral between the parties in conflict and to treat them upon equal terms.

All nations have the duty to cooperate in making effective the sanctions which the international community may adopt against an aggressor.

V. MODIFICATION OF THE CONCEPTION OF SOVEREIGNTY

The sovereignty of the state must be understood in a manner consistent with the supreme necessity of maintaining peace, order and justice in the international community.

In the exercise of their sovereignty nations must recognize and respect the priority of the moral law and of the fundamental principles of international law derived from it.

No nation may claim as an attribute of sovereignty the right to be the judge in its own case or the right to take the law into its own hands and assert its claims by force.

The moral unity of the international community and the effective cooperation of its members call for the coordination of their sovereignty with the fact of their interdependence.

VI. NECESSITY OF A MORE EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

The maintenance of law and order and the application and development of specific rules of international conduct demand the creation of some machinery of international government which can represent the will of the entire community and its collective interests rather than the will and the interests of its individual members, and which can carry into effect its decisions.

The period of transition between the close of the war and the establishment of the future international organization must not be prolonged beyond the time that is strictly necessary, and it must be governed as far as possible by the same principles upon which the organization itself is to be based.

VII. CHARACTER OF THE NEW ASSOCIATION OF NATIONS

The international community must be organized on the basis of the cooperation of all nations

No nation is privileged to remain aloof from the organization thus established.

Whether the organization is to be based upon the League of Nations amended and strengthened, or is to be a new legal institution, it must be so constituted as to reconcile the principle of universality of membership with the existence of regional groups formed by natural bonds of solidarity and common interests.

These regional groups or associations may adopt special rules governing the relations of their members among themselves in matters in which the common interests of the whole international community are not involved.

The functions of the new international organization must be as comprehensive as the political, economic and social needs of the community require. Existing international institutions and treaty agreements must be adjusted to meet new conditions and new needs.

VIII. A MORE EFFECTIVE SYSTEM OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

The primary objective of the new international organization must be the protection of each and all of its members against acts of violence, so that every nation may rely for its security upon the collective action of the community.

Each nation must consider that it has a vital national interest of its own in the maintenance of international law and order, and that every threat or act of violence against any one member of the community constitutes a direct attack against each and all of them.

IX. ABANDONMENT OF THE SYSTEM OF A BALANCE OF POWER. LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

The establishment of an effective system of collective security must put an end to the policy that peace can be secured by a balance of power between opposing groups of states.

Nations must recognize that a just solution of the problem of armaments is an essential condition of an adequate organization of peace.

The limitation of armaments must take place progressively and side by side with the establishment and practical development of the system of collective security, up to the point which is compatible with the maintenance by each state of domestic order and with the fulfillment of its international obligations looking to the collective action of the community.

Nations must not invoke the necessity of self-defense as a ground for increasing their national armaments beyond the extent recognized as justifiable within the system of collective security.

The manufacture of munitions of war should be an exclusive function of the state, the private manufacture and private trade in arms being opposed to the general security.

During the period of transition between the end of hostilities and the definitive establishment of peace, account must be taken of the fact that the nations which have borne the burden of the war against the aggressors may have to keep their armaments in order to re-establish order in territories where there is need to do so. But this temporary right must be exercised with the objective of facilitating the creation of the system of collective security which is to follow, keeping in mind at the same time a gradual solution of the problem of the limitation of armaments.

X. ABANDONMENT OF POLITICAL IMPERIALISM

Political imperialism, in the sense of the acquisition of control over the will of weak nations and over undeveloped countries for political as well as for military purposes, must be abandoned.

Colonies and protectorates must be administered in accordance with the principles laid down in the Covenant of the League of Nations and reaffirmed in the Havana Convention, that the well-being and development of their peoples should form a sacred trust of civilization.

XI. ELIMINATION OF POLITICAL NATIONALISM

An essential condition of the establishment of a permanent peace will be the elimination of the spirit of exaggerated nationalism which concentrates upon the interests of the particular state to the exclusion of the interests of the community at large.

Every effort must be made to get rid of false theories of nationalism which certain governments have made use of in order to create in their

peoples a belief in their superiority over other peoples and consequently, as claimed, in their right to impose their culture upon them.

Doctrinal propaganda carried on in a particular state against mutual understanding between nations must be regarded as an offense against the whole community of nations and as a threat to the general peace.

The state exists for the good of its citizens, and it may not deprive them of the rights which a man possesses because of his human personality and not because the state has conferred them upon him.

Political systems which respect human liberties must be recognized as playing an important part in the cooperation of states.

In view of the fact that moral disarmament is an important factor in promoting peace, states should direct their educational institutions so as to increase mutual understanding between them and to develop within their respective territories, and by all means in their power, sentiments of international cooperation and solidarity.

XII. ELIMINATION OF ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM

The community of nations, acting through its appropriate agencies, must supervise the exploitation of undeveloped territories.

These territories must be administered in accordance with the principle of equality of treatment, so that all states may have equal access to the raw materials which they produce and may be able to sell their manufactured goods in the markets of these territories upon equal terms.

A system of free competition should be established in these territories, which will prevent particular states from having exclusive opportunities for the investment of capital and for other forms of economic enterprise, and which will promote the gradual progress of these territories and the well-being of their native populations, while at the same time protecting the interests of the international community.

XIII. ELIMINATION OF ECONOMIC NATIONALISM

Nations must recognize their economic interdependence, and that in consequence their right to regulate their own economic activities should not be without limitations.

The future international organization must give special attention to the coordination of world economy, and must endeavor to obtain concrete solutions for the problems which it presents, seeking a means of reconciling national self-determination with the predominant interest of the whole community of nations.

Nations must make every effort to lower tariff barriers and remove other restrictions upon commerce, and to increase as far as possible the free and full exchange of articles and services among the members of the international community, so as to lessen as far as possible the inequalities of natural resources and to promote the mutual well-being of their respective peoples.

In order to bring about economic disarmament the system of ruthless competition and trade rivalries must be eliminated, and in its place must be substituted measures of cooperation looking to the general welfare of the international community.

XIV. ELIMINATION OF THE SOCIAL FACTORS OF WAR

Nations must recognize that social justice and the improvement of the conditions of life for the individual citizen have a relation to the maintenance of peace and for that reason must play an essential part in any plans of international reconstruction.

Nations must endeavor to raise the standard of life of their citizens and must guarantee to each individual a degree of economic security which will permit him to live in the sufficiency and freedom from fear necessary to enable him to develop his personality and to enjoy the benefits of spiritual and material freedom to which all men have a right.

The realization of these objectives is primarily the task of each separate state; but only by parallel international action can they be adequately secured.

Nations must organize their national industry so as to meet the needs of all the people and not merely the interests of privileged groups; and while having in mind the interests of their own peoples they must also give consideration to the interests and necessities of the international community.

The social services of the new international organization must be expanded so as to include tasks which are beyond the reach of the individual state. The work of the International Labor Office must be continued to the fullest possible extent.

Rio de Janeiro

September 5, 1942

(S) AFRANO DE MELLO FRANCO

(S) CHARLES G. FENWICK

(S) F. NIETO DEL RÍO

(S) C. E. STOLK

(S) P. CAMPOS ORTÍZ

Preliminary Recommendation on Post-War Problems. Pan American Union, Washington, November 1942, p. 17-22.

2. MEXICO

Mexico is governed by a President assisted by a Cabinet. Both assumed office on December 1, 1940. There is only one national party, the Mexican Revolutionary Party. On September 4, 1939, Mexico declared her neutrality. On April 25, 1941, an agreement was concluded with the United States regarding the transit of military aircraft. On November 19, 1941, agreements were made between the United States and Mexico with the purpose of overcoming all existing differences between the two countries in regard to the expropriation of oil properties.

1941

- Dec. 8 Diplomatic relations were broken off with Japan.
- " 11 Diplomatic relations with Germany and Italy severed.
- " 18 Treaty of friendship with Bulgaria was denounced.
- " 19 Diplomatic relations with Hungary severed.
- " 27 Decree stating that the United States would not be treated as a belligerent.
- " 29 The Senate ratified the oil and other agreements with the United States.

1942

- Feb. 6 Resumption of diplomatic relations with Great Britain (first meeting with a British Minister since April 1938).
- " 27 Joint Mexican-United States Defense Commission set up.
- Mar. 26 Renewal of diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia.
- " 27 Lend-Lease agreement signed. (This agreement is now being revised.)
- May 22 Declaration of war with Germany, Italy and Japan.
- Jun. 5 Adherence to the Declaration by United Nations.
- Nov. 9 Severance of diplomatic relations with France (the Vichy Government).
- " 19 Renewal of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R.
- Dec. 23 Trade Agreement with the United States signed.

Manuel Avila Camacho, President: Message to the Mexican People, Mexico City, December 1, 1940

It is a great fortune that the Americas are united in their resolution to defend our continental doctrine of equality, right, respect, and reciprocal justice against any aggressions. This doctrine of pacific and righteous relations constitutes the only hope to save the civilized ways of international *convivence*, so much wanted in this martyred and bleeding world. Nothing divides us in this our America; the differences which might exist are overcome so that our countries might be confounded between themselves in the high sentiment to make durable a continental life of friendship founded on mutual respect, on the predominance of reason over brute force, of pacific cooperation over mechanical destruction.

The Continental Doctrine in the Mexican Senate, Dept. of State for Foreign Affairs, Bureau of International News Service, 1941, No. 4, p. 7.

Ezequiel Padilla, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Address before the Senate, Mexico City, March 7, 1941

Mexico will uphold the doctrine of continental solidarity no less steadfastly than the other peoples of the Americas. By so doing she will be defending her own destinies as well.

The struggles for human liberties and international justice which constitute the essence of the doctrine of Pan Americanism is what has, through our stormy history, won for us unity and the cohesion of a common fatherland.

.

The principle of the equality of all peoples and condemnation of the crimes committed by brute force are standards of international conduct that have governed our whole existence . . . the Mexican people feel that international policies, unless based on justice and reciprocal respect for one another by the peoples, sweep away every hope of a Christian civilization founded on good will among men . . .

.

We are all familiar with that propaganda designed to blazon the pre-eminence of the Aryan race. History and science alike deny that such superiority can be the exclusive privilege of any one breed of mankind.

.

. . . we are defending our own historical doctrines . . .

Fortunately, we are not alone. These very principles form part of our Continent's spiritual treasure-house. The coming years shall be as abundant springs, from which shall flow a new history; the history of the amphictyony of the peoples of the Americas, of closely-knit Pan American unity.

We proclaim that doctrine. . . .

.

We must resolutely face everything that this implies. I aver that in this year, nineteen hundred and forty-one, the United States has, by means of consistently cordial and positive policies, succeeded in cementing Pan American confidence.

[Here follows a review of the Good Neighbor Policy
of the United States Government since March 4, 1933.]

.

International existence is not compounded of romanticism, but of actual realities. So that the strengthening of an international common purpose is the best foundation for our mutual interests.

The structural differences existing between our various nations, far from being causes of estrangement, are cumulative forces that work for unity.

That which has, in the United States, reached saturation point, in our Ibero-American peoples is wide open opportunity.

A wise Pan American policy should coordinate our spiritual resources. To bind together technics, science, and creative capital, supplied by the former, with the enormous potential resources and splendid opportunities offered by the latter, is an objective easy of achievement, without appeal to violence, or disregard of the claims of brotherhood. It will not only redound to the benefit of that physical power that shall make us invulnerable in the military and in the economic sense, but also serve the loftiest ethical ends of our civilization. This is what makes us feel certain that it will be possible to establish closest unity and friendship in these our Americas.

We must have faith in the virtues of sincere collaboration. The cause of the defense of our Continent does not imply either one-sided advantage or sacrifice, for this would otherwise be its negation.

Solidarity when danger threatens involves solidarity when it comes to enjoying the blessings of peace. This means loyal cooperation based on cultural and economic interchange for the spread of civilization, of effective democracy, and of prosperity, more especially among the peoples of the Americas.

We must, on the other hand, have faith in the value of democracy.

The principles of democracy, by spreading beyond the frontiers of all nations, and on being raised to the heights of an international standard, are the only factors that will be able to consolidate, not an insincere union, fraught with danger, of resentful nations, but a firm and decided Confederation of sovereign peoples. Because democracy is not merely a system of politics; it is a philosophy of life, that informs all its activities and which is absolutely essential to Pan American existence.

Personal dictatorships adjust their action to motives of secret ambition and acts of open hostility, that are their allies in war. Democratic systems seek the straightforward paths of law, good will and mutual respect, as their allies in peace.

.

We must therefore prepare. We must resolutely cooperate with one another, not for aggression against any people of the earth, but for the

defense of this Hemisphere. We must hold it up as an example, and as the best hope for a world in which brotherhood and justice shall finally prevail.

Our nations must dwell together under the aegis of law and the right. To fight under the banner of the freedom of mankind, is deemed a luminous privilege by the sister nations of the Americas.

The Continental Doctrine in the Mexican Senate, Dept. of State for Foreign Affairs, Bureau of International News Service, Mexico, 1941, No. 4, p. 31-43.

Manuel Avila Camacho, President: Answers to Questions on the Mexican International Policy Brought Forward by the Secretary of the Confederation of Latin American Workers, Mexico, June 1941

. . . The course of action which Mexico has adopted is firm and unchangeable, and it is based on the following fundamental principles: recognition of the democratic equality of nations; respect for the rights consequent to the sovereignty and independence of nations; firm conviction that peace is not a regional or local guaranty, but a general, universal condition, indivisible in its consequences and based on the principles of collective security of nations; subordination of the individual aspirations of each nation to the limitations set forth by treaties; condemnation of all unilateral acquisitions obtained by force; friendly co-operation of States with strict adherence to the rule that no nation, regardless of its high cultural level or of the power of its economic, technical or military forces, may claim the right to intervene in the affairs of the other nations.

The International Policy of Mexico. Department of State for Foreign Affairs, the International Press Service Bureau, No. 6, Mexico, 1941, p. 7-8.

Ezequiel Padilla, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Address, Washington, April 6, 1942¹

. . . The power of the democracies rests in the fact that their fight is one of free will. Time serves them, and sooner or later, accumulative spiritual forces will triumph over the accumulated weakness of their enemies.

¹ Transmitted throughout the United States by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

What motivates the countries of America in this struggle? Ideologically, a defined and unanimous conviction: the principles of life that are genuinely American, aspiration for welfare, fraternity, a pacific organization that raises souls above hate and terror, before a tradition and a proposition of despotism, of subjugation of tyranny, of ruling the destinies of the earth.

.

. . . When the war ends, a wave of misery, of collective suffering will sweep the world and unless plans for the future are made with a basis of generosity and justice, America and humanity will run the risk of but passing from the catastrophe of war to the catastrophe of peace. United America is laden with possibilities and promises for rebuilding peace. Proclaiming this faith in the heart of our countries, maintaining this unity against the forces of evil, so that in all times and in all countries the generous efforts of men of good will shall avail. Let us construct unitedly in doctrine and action this future of America which will fulfill the hopes of the world. That, indeed, is a goal for the noble patriotism of our peoples and the lofty consideration of their directors. This constructive doctrine, this military temple of America in a time of peril, is the offering of honor and security which we have pledged to destiny as a guarantee of our indissoluble unity.

Mexico News, April 30, 1942.

Ezequiel Padilla, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Address at the Special Meeting of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union, Washington, April 6, 1942

.

When beyond the alternatives and the uncertainty that the future holds in store for us the hour of victory arrives for the democracies, humanity will meet in a stage of misery, on the widespread ruins of civilization, of the soul. It will be the hour for the great mission the American continent has to achieve: that of exerting all of its powers to alleviate the moral and physical hunger of a world in disgrace. If America, which is the only continent capable of such an achievement, cannot stop and divert with organized foresight that must begin on this day the overwhelming wave of pain and despair, peace will be a catastrophe even more destructive than war itself. At no other time in history was there a responsibility more paramount or a mission of parallel Christian character entrusted to a union of peoples.

.

Release from Pan American Union, Washington.

Manuel Avila Camacho, President: Speech Broadcast on the Occasion of the Day of the Americas, Mexico City, April 14, 1942

.

. . . From the present contest democracy will arise kindlier and lustier than ever, more fully concerned with the needs of social justice, less submissive to the hazards of wealth, better fitted to uplift the weak and helpless, and consequently worthier to grapple with the problems of the whole of humanity.

Without yielding to futile impulse, without boastfulness, the Americas are ready to exact respect for their rights and inflexibly to uphold, together with the principle of the free determination of the States, their own loyalty to the cause of culture.

In our attitude there is no room either for contempt or hatred towards those beings who are now fighting — in many cases against their will — under the lash wielded by the dictators. We know well that in their inmost hearts many of the men whom the totalitarian leaders are sending forth to their doom feel a longing for freedom that the propaganda lavished by their governments vainly attempts to conceal

The war that rages all around us is not only a conflict between peoples but a dramatic clash between systems. When the despots are dragged down by defeat, the very nations that today strive to overthrow the integral structure of democracy will realize the cruel error in which they were kept by the Fascist and Nazi creeds. They will then join us in the task facing us, of building up a system under which all the continents may dwell in the manner longed for by the Americas: without enmity, or rancor, or oppression.

This is the ideological content of the Mexican Revolution, and the wish voiced by Mexico on this day, the day of the Americas. May the flood of discord subside, may the unity of our hemisphere become an assured and permanent fact, under the imminence of danger. When the darkness that now encompasses us dissolves, may the light of liberty shed its light anew on all men.

Mexico News, April 30, 1942, p. 16.

Manuel Avila Camacho, President: Address to the Congress on the Declaration of War with Germany, Italy and Japan,¹ Mexico City, May 28, 1942

.

In the comparison drawn between the forces that strive to destroy the civilization of mankind the impression caused by the disparity between our power and those forces is counteracted when we realize that among

¹ On May 22, 1942.

the weapons at our command we have ideals, right on our side and love of liberty. These are what the democracies, large and small, of the world are also fighting for.

.
Mexico in State of War, Dept. of State and Foreign
 Affairs the International Press Service Bureau, No. 14,
 1942, p. 18.

Adherence to Declaration by United Nations: Ezequiel Padilla, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Letter to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, June 5, 1942

[Translation]

Your Excellency has undoubtedly had occasion, during recent years, to evaluate the international conduct observed by Mexico in the face of the constant transgressions of law committed by the powers which, having equal aims from the beginning, subsequently ended by associating themselves in their unbridled ambition for world domination, signing the Tripartite Pact. From the time when, in September 1939, an uncontrollable Pan-Germanism, clothed in a singularly arbitrary dictatorial ideology, unloosed war on Europe, the Government of Mexico has given public expression to its sympathy for the cause of the democracies which are trying to prevent the world from falling under the despotism of the totalitarian States. Hence, interpreting this obvious policy of the Government of Mexico, at the third consultative meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, it, with true pleasure, signed Resolution XXXV relating to the Atlantic Charter. Now that my Government, for reasons of which Your Excellency is aware, has found itself compelled, in defense of its outraged sovereignty, to declare itself to be in a state of war with Germany, Italy and Japan, it considers that the time has arrived to give more concrete adherence to the joint program outlined by His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, and by His Excellency, Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, on August 14, 1941. In taking this decision my Government does but continue the firm line of its national policy. In fact, the principles contained in the Atlantic Charter coincide with the aspirations for social justice which have invariably ruled the actions of my country in the international field; they indicate, as goals of the present conflict, objectives of such importance and nobility as to justify the greatest sacrifices; and, in brief, they constitute an ideal for the realization of which Mexico has worked from the beginning of its independent life. Accordingly, I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that in

accordance with instructions which I have received from the President of the Republic Mexico formally adheres, by means of the present message, to the declaration of the United Nations dated January 1, 1942.

D. S. Bul. VI, p. 546-7; *I-A.R.*, 1942, II, p. 117-18.

Manuel Avila Camacho, President: Message to the National Congress, September 1, 1942

... Our own future is but a small fraction of the future of the continental democracies. To national unity we must add international cohesion, the solidarity of America.

Up to now America has lived to some degree under the influence of European culture, which nurtured it for several centuries. The menace that threatens us today has reawakened in our republics a desire for cooperation and spiritual affinity, which during the conflict will enable us to perfect our defense and, on the restoration of normal conditions abroad, be instrumental in strengthening our economy, regulating our markets, establishing procedures for juridical relationships, and, through a more equitable distribution of production, raising the standard of living of our peoples.

The Americas in a World at War, Washington: Pan American Union, 1943, p. 12.

Manuel Avila Camacho, President: Speech on the Occasion of the Formal Constitution of the Supreme Council of National Defense, Mexico City, September 15, 1942

In the necessity for intensifying intercontinental commerce, because of the war, the American peoples must see that a loyal cooperation will help to overcome many contingencies; but that our capacity of exchange, restricted by similarity of production, will have to be substantially built up if the hemisphere is to constitute in the future a rational economic organism.

This, anew, leads us to the political sphere. In effect, for like cooperation to be feasible it is inevitable that the eventualities of aggression and armed fighting disappear from the earth. We must affirm collective security, radically eliminate the spirit of conquest and of illegitimate gain and the conciliation of sensible interests will give place to a harmony in which each nation will be a part of the whole where the idea of defense will be replaced by the ideal of reciprocal aid and of cohesion.

Mexico News, October 15, 1942, p. 8.

Ezequiel Padilla, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Article on "Sovereignty and Peace" in Foreign Affairs, October 1942

To undertake the task [of winning the peace] successfully, to overcome all the incalculable material difficulties in the way, it will be essential that every nation sacrifice some of that aggressive pride which has distorted the notion of sovereignty. The new order which will arise from this terrible conflagration will not be, of course, Hitler's vandal and sterile "new order," but one based on law, more elastic, yet stronger. All the States will have to collaborate in it by curbing their individual ambitions, cutting down their armies, and building up a system in which war is outlawed, in which differences between nations may be settled without the idiotic resort to force.

Some kind of a universal structure will have to be created, including a coordinating council on which all the nations are represented. This body will act as a board of arbitration, as an international court of justice and as an official mediator in every conflict. But aside from this, it will be indispensable to give a new meaning to what we today term national sovereignty. In future, no country may, as a function of its own independence, endanger the independence of others. The liberty of each shall be respected to the extent that it does not injure any other. But license to work evil will be curbed by moral, commercial, economic and legal sanctions which will render impossible the hegemony of any one state. Machinery will have to be constituted to put such sanctions into effect. In a world where sovereignties are unrestricted the weak are at the mercy of the strong. So long as equality of rights is not coupled with equality of opportunities and equal access to resources, the arbitrary dictum of unlimited sovereignty — like that of absolute liberty of the individual in domestic life — will benefit the powerful and give an advantage to the aggressive. Now in reality there is no such thing as natural equality. States, therefore, if abandoned to the dialectical play of action and reaction, will invariably revert to inequality so long as there does not exist a higher agency which is able to curb the stronger in favor of the weaker, and further, as between the powerful themselves, establish a clear and equitable balance. In enforcing international law, that agency would not curtail any sovereignty: it only would coordinate it with other sovereignties, just as in the democratic balance within a republic the liberty of citizens is not reduced merely because they entrust the exercise of some of their rights to a central authority which acts on their behalf and sees to it that order is observed by all.

No disarmament, whether of armies or of the spirit, can be attained so long as the exaggerated notion of national sovereignty which prevailed throughout the nineteenth century and in the early years of the twentieth is still entertained. Nor should we overlook the fact that it was by virtue of the inordinate notion of sovereignty that Germany restored military service and reoccupied the Rhineland, that Mussolini took the diplomatic steps which preceded the invasion of Ethiopia, and that the three dictatorships of Germany, Italy, and Japan betrayed their international commitments and, breaking away from Geneva, combined to attack the whole of peace-loving humanity. Such cases must never be repeated.

. . . in organic aggregations of broader scope the sovereignty of each individual entity must conform to the conditions required by the coordination of the whole.

The peoples of the New World aspire to form an association of this kind. It may properly be pointed out, in this connection, that the outstanding difference between the earlier Pan American hope and the present-day reality lies in one main fact. The politicians of the days of independence sought by achieving continental unity to counteract European action; while the politicians of today realize clearly that Pan Americanism must not and cannot be thought of solely as a bulwark for isolation but as a road leading to more efficient universal cooperation.

"The peace of Europe," said a Cuban internationalist, Orestes Ferrara, only a short while ago, "is the peace of the Americas." The converse proposition also holds true. No merely local settlement can be stable or final. Whether we like it or not, the modern world constitutes a single compact whole. This being so, any formulas that we may adopt in this hemisphere, however valuable from the standpoint of defense, will yield their full fruits only when the other continents likewise organize on a basis of close interdependence. They must associate in vast amphictyonies governed by the same law as that advocated by the Americas: the exaltation of liberty within a juridical system in which the sovereignty of the states shall at no time conflict with the general solidarity of the human race.

Foreign Affairs, vol. 21, 1942-43, p. 1-10.

Manuel Avila Camacho, President: Speech at Mexico City, October 10, 1942

All economic agreements concluded to date are not transitory and due to the war. They are permanent, because our aim is that, when the present conflict is ended, we shall live in harmony. We intend to respect

the productive capacity of nations. If a given country produces certain specified products, we will not be her competitor by producing the same products for the same export markets. In other words, solidarity depends on the coordination of the continental economy.

Mexican Embassy, Washington, D. C.

Manuel Avila Camacho, President: Broadcast Message Announcing Severance of Relations with France (Vichy Government), Mexico City, November 12, 1942

. . . This fight is not inspired by motives of dominion but in a generous will of reconquest. Its triumph will be the first step toward the liberation of invaded Europe. And all the aid that is given for that triumph to be consolidated will certainly assure the restoration of that noble France that is now under the despotic yoke of the barbarians.

The French may place absolute faith in what Mexico says now. Because Mexico, which has always had confidence in France and loved France, has never raised her international voice but in defense of a just cause. And what is more noble than the re-establishment of a Republic which, like hers, was the cradle of liberty in the West, an example of equality and democracy, and symbol of fraternity for the entire world?

The United Nations do not want a victory from which France would be excluded. In the Allied banners that now wave in North Africa there is a breeze that is not strange to the French: that of independence. The soldiers who bear those flags are their brothers, and at the same time they are our brothers. The battle that they wage is the battle of justice!

. . . We reiterate our desire that at the end of the present conflict, united France will resume being what she has always been: an eminent power of glory and dignity.

Mexico News, 1942, II, 28, p. 2.

3. OTHER AMERICAN REPUBLICS

1941

- Aug. 2 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and the Dominican Republic signed.
- “ 6 Supplementary Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and the Dominican Republic signed.
- Sept. 16 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Haiti signed.
- “ 20 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Paraguay signed.

1941

- Oct 14 Reciprocal Trade Agreement between the United States and Argentine signed.
- “ 16 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Nicaragua signed.
- Nov 7 Lend-Lease Agreement between United States and Cuba signed.
- Dec. 6 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Bolivia signed.
- “ 8 Declaration of war with Japan by Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras and Nicaragua.
- “ “ Severance of diplomatic relations with Japan by Colombia.
- “ “ Declaration by Brazil, Ecuador and Uruguay of solidarity and non-belligerency.
- “ 9 Declaration of war with Japan by Cuba.
- “ “ Declaration by Argentine, Chile and Venezuela of solidarity and non-belligerency.
- “ 10 Declaration of war with Japan by Panama.
- “ “ Declaration by Bolivia and Paraguay of solidarity and non-belligerency
- “ 11 Declaration of war with Germany and Italy by Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic and Guatemala.
- “ 12 Declaration of war with Germany and Italy by Haiti, Honduras and Panama.
- “ 13 Declaration of war with Germany and Italy by El Salvador.
- “ 19 Severance of diplomatic relations with Germany and Italy by Colombia.
- “ “ Declaration of war with Bulgaria, Hungary and Rumania by Nicaragua
- “ 22 Declaration by Colombia of solidarity and non-belligerency.
- “ 23 Second supplementary Reciprocal Trade Agreement between United States and Cuba signed.
- “ 31 Severance of diplomatic relations by Venezuela with Japan, Germany and Italy.

1942

- Jan 1 Declaration by United Nations signed by Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama.¹
- “ 13 Lend-Lease Agreement between United States and Uruguay.
- “ 16 Lend-Lease Agreement between United States and Costa Rica.
- “ 24 Severance of diplomatic relations with Japan, Germany and Italy by Peru.
- “ 25 Severance of diplomatic relations with Japan, Germany and Italy by Paraguay and Uruguay.
- “ 28 Severance of diplomatic relations with Japan, Germany and Italy by Bolivia and Brazil.
- “ 29 Severance of diplomatic relations with Japan, Germany and Italy by Ecuador.
- Feb. 2 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and El Salvador.
- “ 7 Agreement between the United States and the Netherlands, with the approval of Venezuela, for defense of Curaçao and Aruba.
- “ 27 Exchange-stabilization agreement between United States and Ecuador signed.

¹ Mexico adhered on June 5, 1942, Brazil on February 6, 1943, and Peru adhered to the principles of the Atlantic Charter on February 8, 1943

1942

- Feb. 28 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Honduras.
- Mar. 3 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Brazil (super-seded agreement of October 1, 1941).
- “ “ Exchange of notes providing for series of economic and financial measures.
- “ 7 Reciprocal Trade Agreement between the United States and Peru signed.
- “ 11 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Peru.
- “ 17 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Colombia.
- “ 18 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Venezuela.
- Apr. 6 Lend-Lease Agreement between United States and Ecuador.
- “ “ Memorandum initialed, covering agreements with Haiti pursuant to Lend-Lease Agreement and resolutions of Inter-American conferences.
- “ 23 Economic and financial agreements between United States and Peru signed.
- “ 25 Economic and financial agreements, including one on purchase of rubber, with Nicaragua announced.
- May 2 Severance of diplomatic relations with Hungary by Chile.
- “ 7 Reciprocal Trade Agreement between the United States and Peru signed.
- “ 15 Severance of diplomatic relations with Hungary and Rumania by Costa Rica.
- “ 18 Agreement between the United States and Panama on defense sites in the Republic of Panama.
- Jun. 16 Rubber agreement between United States and Costa Rica for purchase for next five years signed.
- “ 18 Agreement between United States and Cuba for military collaboration.
- Jul. 3 Rubber agreement between the United States and Colombia signed.
- “ 6 Exchange-stabilization agreement for five years between United States and Brazil signed.
- “ “ Exchange-stabilization agreement between the United States and Cuba signed.
- “ 15 Rubber agreement between the United States and Bolivia signed.
- “ 21 Rubber agreement between United States and Ecuador, announcement of signature.
- “ “ Reciprocal Trade Agreement between the United States and Uruguay signed.
- Aug. 3 Rubber agreement between United States and Honduras, announcement of signature.
- “ 22 Declaration of war with Germany and Italy by Brazil.
- “ 24 Rubber agreement between the United States and El Salvador, announcement of signature.
- Sept. 5 Commercial agreement between Argentina and Spain signed.
- “ 7 Military and naval cooperation between the United States and Cuba signed.
- “ 10 Rubber agreement between United States and Guatemala, announcement of signature.
- “ 14 Rubber agreement between United States and Panama, announcement of signature.
- Oct. 16 Rubber agreement between the United States and Venezuela, announcement of signature.
- “ 29 Reciprocal trade treaty between Argentina and Venezuela signed at Buenos Aires.

1942

- Nov. 10 Severance of diplomatic relations with France (Vichy Government) by Cuba.
- “ 11 Treaty of amity between China and Cuba signed at Havana.
- “ “ Commercial treaty between Peru and Venezuela signed at Lima.
- “ 12 Severance of diplomatic relations with France (Vichy Government) by Brazil.
- “ 15 Severance of diplomatic relations with France (Vichy Government) by El Salvador.
- “ 16 Lend-Lease Agreement between the United States and Guatemala.
- “ 27 Severance of diplomatic relations with France (Vichy Government) by Colombia, Ecuador and Peru.

A. Panama

Proclamation Issued by the Government of Panama on December 7, 1941

The Government of Panama takes this occasion to reassert once more a universal declaration that Panama at all times shall be on the side of the democratic principles which form the constitutional and republican foundation of the Panamanian nation and that it shall continue to co-operate with the Government of the United States in a loyal, honest, decided and energetic manner in this grave emergency which threatens the principles so ardently defended by the American Republics as the indispensable foundations for their existence as sovereign and free nations.

D. S. Bul., V, p. 499; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 342.

B. Venezuela

Isaias M. Angarita, President of Venezuela: Address, December 9, 1941

During the last few years we have witnessed with grief and sympathy the bloody crisis that has put to an acid test the principles that have always been considered the aim and essence of our civilization. The peoples of America achieved independence under these principles, which they consider to be the most essential to human dignity. The consequences and reverberations of the present conflict have affected us in varying degree. Yet, notwithstanding its ominous implications, we were able to observe them with no little assurance because the family of American nations remained united and through solemn agreements had reaffirmed its loyalty to those traditional principles. But the recent aggression against the United States brings the tragic threat to the very

gates of America, and each of our peoples is faced with the immediate necessity of assuming its obligations. I wish to make it clear that Venezuela will fully comply with its commitments, without boastfulness or extravagant gestures and with the restraint of a nation that is at all times worthy of its glorious traditions and knows how to honor its pledged word. Those who deal with us know that they can rely on us.

The Americas in a World at War, Washington: Pan American Union, 1943, p. 13.

C. Colombia

Eduardo Santos, President of Colombia: Address, December 18, 1941

Pan American solidarity takes into consideration at one and the same time our political ideals, our ethical principles and the safeguarding of our material interests. It is a guarantee of the sovereignty and independence of our nations, and a program for the spiritual development of our peoples. When, however, the time comes that all this is threatened, this solidarity also has its responsibilities, and we are under obligation to join, wholeheartedly and valiantly, the side that coincides with our moral and physical interests, our loyalty to the democratic principles that guide our civil life, and our duty to fulfill our international agreements.

The Americas in a World at War, Washington: Pan American Union, 1943, p. 11.

D. Brazil

Getulio Vargas, President of Brazil:¹ Address at the Third Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Rio de Janeiro, January 15-28, 1942

The American Continent — which has no insurmountable differences, speaks four languages easily learned by its inhabitants, has a common Christian heritage, identical political ideals, and easily reconcilable interests — can organize the firmest and mightiest alliance of free and sovereign nations ever recorded in the history of mankind.

With our example, with our determination to fulfill what was an aspiration of Bolivar's far-seeing political genius, we can help re-establish the world's balance, and demonstrate the falsity of any philosophy, doctrine, or ideology that advocates hate, division, strife, and violence.

The Americas in a World at War, Washington: Pan American Union, 1943, p. 11

¹ Brazil adhered to the Declaration by United Nations, February 6, 1943

E. Uruguay

Alberto Guani, Minister of Foreign Affairs: Address to the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, Montevideo, 1942¹

Today all the efforts of our Republics must be directed towards the development of a common and united defense. If in the traditional Pan American manner we must zealously preserve our ideals, in the face of today's painful realities, it is also our duty to join in a program of effective action and to adopt measures that will exclude from our continent, and from each and every one of the American countries, the use of force as a way of life and of war transformed into a constant and permanent mark of infamy for mankind.

It is well known that the American nations never undertook to impose on other states the political regime under which they live. But neither will they permit the infiltration of ideologies that can serve only as a cloak to cover the bonds of servitude.

The Americas in a World at War, Washington: Pan American Union, 1943, p. 12.

F. Costa Rica

Rafael A. C. Guardia, President of Costa Rica: Message to Congress, May 1, 1942

. . . We felt obliged, by the stern demands of national honor and by our keen interest as members of the Pan American family, to look, not with indifference, on the present conflict, to run the same risks as the United States and, if need be, to contribute everything in our power for the common defense of the continent.

The Americas in a World at War, Washington: Pan American Union, 1943, p. 11.

G. Peru

Manuel Prado, President of Peru: Address at the Special Meeting of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union, Washington, May 9, 1942

.

Let us cast our eyes toward the future of the New World. We are of necessity united today in danger, as we were yesterday in glory, and as we shall be tomorrow in a state of general well-being. Let us prepare the work of reconstruction that must follow the hecatomb, completely ex-

¹ First meeting held April 15, 1942 (*D. S. Bul.*, VIII, p. 69)

tinguishing the spirit of violence and of conquest that seeks to dominate the world. America is the land of promise for humanity. Men, races, nations live here under the shelter of democracy. Our civilization has its origin in the Gospel, whose light came to us with the caravels of Columbus and was strengthened by the influence of the Renaissance. Our economic systems and our needs complement each other. We all love liberty. And if during these moments of danger we share the same anxiety, it is because all Americans, North, Central, and South, desire a definite, honorable, and worthy peace, a peace in which there shall be neither oppressor nor oppressed, in which the dictates of violence and hate shall not prevail, in which all ideologies of force and despotism shall be outlawed, and in which the equilibrium of the world shall be re-established on immovable, just, and humane foundations.

Release from the Pan American Union, Washington.

Manuel Prado, President of Peru: Message to Congress, July 28, 1942

In the face of the aggression against the New World, the other nations of this continent cannot stand aside as mere spectators of the bloody struggle in which the land of Washington has been unwillingly involved. Their solidarity with that country and with its principles and its way of life, which will never be compatible with ideologies of hate and violence, points out the way of duty and honor.

Peru, a defender of the noble principles of democracy as demonstrated throughout a long history marked by no little sacrifice, and loyal to its honorable traditions, attended the meeting at Rio de Janeiro firmly resolved to find a solution to the political, social and economic problems under discussion. We have unswerving faith in the success of this Pan American crusade, which has for its noblest objective respect for law, for justice, for national sovereignty, and for self-determination of all peoples.

The Americas in a World at War, Washington: Pan American Union, 1943, p. 12.

H. Cuba

Fulgencio Batista, President: Address to the Congress of the United States, Washington, December 10, 1942

. . . The policy of the good neighbor has brought new hope to those of us of the New World who cherish the ideal of justice: to those of us who desire for humanity, suffering today in the Old World, that the ghastly

nightmare of not being able to think except through the mind of another, nor to move without compulsion, should cease forever.

It can be said that from the moment the Atlantic Charter was proclaimed, a brighter perspective dawned for our nations, for this document embodies the essential principles which are the inspiration of a group of nations which seek neither domination nor conquest, but rather the advent for humanity of an era in which it may live in peace and enjoy the unalienable right to the pursuit of happiness. . . .

The responsibility of those of us who govern the United Nations at this critical time in the history of the world is truly grave, for we cannot limit ourselves to leading our people to victory, because this task would be sterile and ineffective, if in constructing the political system of the future we should not profit by the lessons of experience and if we were not to undertake the reconstruction of the world on the bases of the most absolute justice. Cuba occupies her place of honor at the side of her constant ally in this grave struggle, and wishes to contribute to the limit of her strength in the reconstruction of the world in which the sons of those who suffered the ignominy of yesterday and of those who fell in the struggle to achieve liberty, may live without the suffering and anguish of today. . . .

Cong. Rec., 77th Cong., 2nd sess., vol. 88, p. 9756.

APPENDIX I. THE CHURCHES

1. THE VATICAN

Pope Pius XII: Encyclical Letter on the Function of the State in the Modern World (Summi Pontificatus), October 20, 1939

.

Those who enter the Church, whatever be their origin or their speech, must know that they have equal rights as children in the House of the Lord, where the law of Christ and the peace of Christ prevail.

.

Nor is there any fear lest the consciousness of universal brotherhood aroused by the teaching of Christianity, and the spirit which it inspires, be in contrast with love of traditions or the glories of one's fatherland, or impede the progress of prosperity or legitimate interests. For that same Christianity teaches that in the exercise of charity we must follow a God-given order, yielding the place of honor in our affections and good works to those who are bound to us by special ties. Nay, the Divine Master Himself gave an example of this preference for His Own country and fatherland as He wept over the coming destruction of the Holy City. But legitimate and well-ordered love of our native country should not make us close our eyes to the all-embracing nature of Christian charity, which calls for consideration of others and of their interests in the pacifying light of love.

.

. . . forgetfulness of the law of universal charity — of that charity which alone can consolidate peace by extinguishing hatred and softening envies and dissensions — is the source of very grave evils for peaceful relations between nations.

.

To consider the State as something ultimate to which everything else should be subordinated and directed, cannot fail to harm the true and lasting prosperity of nations. This can happen either when unrestricted dominion comes to be conferred on the State as having a mandate from the nation, people, or even a social order, or when the State arrogates such dominion to itself as absolute master, despotically, without any

mandate whatsoever. If, in fact, the State lays claim to and directs private enterprises, these, ruled as they are by delicate and complicated internal principles which guarantee and assure the realization of their special aims, may be damaged to the detriment of the public good, by being wrenched from their natural surroundings, that is, from responsible private action.

.

The idea which credits the State with unlimited authority is not simply an error harmful to the internal life of nations, to their prosperity, and to the larger and well-ordered increase in their well-being, but likewise it injures the relations between peoples, for it breaks the unity of supra-national society, robs the law of nations of its foundation and vigor, leads to violation of others' rights and impedes agreement and peaceful intercourse.

.

So, Venerable Brethren, it is indispensable for the existence of harmonious and lasting contacts and of fruitful relations, that the peoples recognize and observe these principles of international natural law which regulate their normal development and activity. Such principles demand respect for corresponding rights to independence, to life and to the possibility of continuous development in the paths of civilization; they demand, further, fidelity to compacts agreed upon and sanctioned in conformity with the principles of the law of nations.

The indispensable presupposition, without doubt, of all peaceful intercourse between nations, and the very soul of the juridical relations in force among them, is mutual trust; the expectation and conviction that each party will respect its plighted word; the certainty that both sides are convinced that "Better is wisdom, than weapons of war" (*Ecclesiastes* ix : 18), and are ready to enter into discussion and to avoid recourse to force or to threats of force in case of delays, hindrances, changes or disputes, because all these things can be the result not of bad will, but of changed circumstances and of genuine interests in conflict.

But on the other hand, to tear the law of nations from its anchor in Divine law, to base it on the autonomous will of States, is to dethrone that very law and deprive it of its noblest and strongest qualities. Thus it would stand abandoned to the fatal drive of private interest and collective selfishness exclusively intent on the assertion of its own rights and ignoring those of others.

Now, it is true that with the passage of time and the substantial change of circumstances, which were not and perhaps could not have been foreseen in the making of a treaty, such a treaty or some of its clauses can in fact become, or at least seem to become, unjust, impracticable or too burdensome for one of the parties. It is obvious that should such be the case, recourse should be had in good time to a frank discussion with a view to modifying the treaty or making another in its stead. But to consider treaties on principle as ephemeral and tacitly to assume the authority of rescinding them unilaterally when they are no longer to one's advantage, would be to abolish all mutual trust among States. In this way, natural order would be destroyed and there would be seen dug between different peoples and nations trenches of division impossible to refill.

.

Once the bitterness and the cruel strifes of the present have ceased, the new order of the world, of national and international life, must rest no longer on the quicksands of changeable and ephemeral standards that depend only on the selfish interests of groups and individuals. No, they must rest on the unshakeable foundation, on the solid rock of natural law and of Divine Revelation. There the human legislator must attain to that balance, that keen sense of moral responsibility, between the legitimate use and the abuse of power. Thus only will his decisions have internal consistency, noble dignity and religious sanction, and be immune from selfishness and passion.

For true though it is that the evils from which mankind suffers today come in part from economic instability and from the struggle of interests regarding a more equal distribution of the goods which God has given man as a means of sustenance and progress, it is not less true that their root is deeper and more intrinsic, belonging to the sphere of religious belief and moral convictions which have been perverted by the progressive alienation of the peoples from that unity of doctrine, faith, customs and morals which once was promoted by the tireless and beneficent work of the Church. If it is to have any effect, the re-education of mankind must be, above all things, spiritual and religious. Hence, it must proceed from Christ as from its indispensable foundation; must be actuated by justice and crowned by charity.

.

Summi Pontificatus. Encyclical Letter. Official Vatican English Translation, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C., p. 19-22, 24-5, 29-34, 45, 46.

Pope Pius XII: Christmas Message, December 24, 1939

We believe those who with watchful eyes consider these serious potentialities and the possibility of such an evolution of events will, notwithstanding war and its horrible accompaniments, hold themselves wholly prepared to define clearly, so far as they themselves are concerned, the fundamental points of a just and honorable peace at the opportune moment; and that they would not flatly reject opportunity for negotiations, whenever the occasion presents itself, with the necessary guarantees and security.

First. A fundamental condition of a just and honorable peace is to assure the right to life and independence of all nations, large and small, strong and weak. One nation's will to live must never be tantamount to a death sentence for another. When this equality of rights has been destroyed, injured or imperilled, the juridical order requires reparation whose measure and extent are not determined by the sword or selfish, arbitrary judgment, but by the standards of justice and reciprocal equity.

Second. That order, re-established in such a manner, may be tranquil and durable — the cardinal principles of true peace — nations must be liberated from the heavy slavery of the race for armaments and from the danger that material force, instead of serving to protect rights, become the tyrannical violator of them.

Conclusions of peace which failed to attribute fundamental importance to disarmament, mutually accepted, organic and progressive both in practice and spirit, and failed to carry out this disarmament loyally, would sooner or later reveal their inconsistency and lack of vitality.

Third. In any reordering of international community life it would conform to the rules of human wisdom for all parties concerned to examine the consequences of the gaps and deficiencies of the past; and in creating or reconstituting the international institutions, which have so lofty a mission and at the same time one that is so difficult and full of the gravest responsibilities, they should keep present before them the experiences which poured from the inefficacy or defective operation of similar previous projects.

And, since it is so difficult — one would be tempted to say almost impossible — for human weakness to foresee everything and assure everything at the time of the drafting of treaties of peace — when it is difficult to be entirely free from passions and bitterness — the establishment of juridical institutions, which serve to guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfillment of terms and, in case of recognized need, to revise

and correct them, is of decisive importance for an honorable acceptance of a peace treaty and to avoid arbitrary and unilateral ruptures and interpretations of the terms of these treaties.

Fourth. A point which should draw particular attention if better ordering of Europe is sought, concerns the real needs and just demands of nations and of peoples as well as of ethnical minorities: demands which, if not always sufficient to form a strict right when there are recognized or confirmed treaties or other juridical titles which oppose them, deserve at all events benevolent examination to meet them in a peaceful way and, where it appears necessary, by means of equitable, wise and harmonious revision of treaties.

Once true equilibrium among nations is thus brought back and the basis of mutual trust is re-established, many of the incentives to resort to violence would be removed.

Fifth. But even better and more complete settlements will be imperfect and condemned to ultimate failure, if those who guide the destinies of peoples, and the peoples themselves, do not allow themselves to be penetrated always more and more by that spirit from which alone can arise life, authority and obligation for the dead letter of articles in international agreements — by that spirit, namely, of intimate, acute responsibility that measures and weighs human statutes according to the holy, unshakeable rules of Divine Law; by that hunger and thirst for justice which is proclaimed as a Beatitude in the Sermon on the Mount, and which has, as a natural presupposition, moral justice; by that universal love which is the compendium of and most comprehensive term for the Christian ideal, and therefore throws across also a bridge to those who have not the benefit of participating in our own Faith.

.
Pius XII and Peace, 1939-1940, p. 38-41.

***Pope Pius XII: Letter to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, January 7, 1940*¹**

. . . When that day dawns — and We would like to hope that it is not far distant — on which the roar of battle will lapse into silence and there will arise the possibility of establishing a true and sound peace dictated by the principle of justice and equity, only he will be able to discern the path that should be followed who unites with high political power a clear understanding of the voice of humanity along with a sincere reverence

¹ For President Roosevelt's letter see section United States, p. 20.

for the divine precepts of life as found in the Gospel of Christ. Only men of such moral stature will be able to create the peace, that will compensate for the incalculable sacrifices of this war and clear the way for a comity of nations, fair to all, efficacious and sustained by mutual confidence.

.

And now that in this hour of world-wide pain and misgiving the Chief Magistrate of the great North American Federation, under the spell of the Holy Night of Christmas, should have taken such a prominent place in the vanguard of those who would promote peace and generously succor the victims of the war, bespeaks a providential help, which We acknowledge with grateful joy and increased confidence. It is an exemplary act of fraternal and hearty solidarity between the New and the Old World in defense against the chilling breath of aggressive and deadly godless and anti-Christian tendencies, that threaten to dry up the fountainhead, whence civilization has come and drawn its strength. . . .

.

National Catholic Welfare Conference, News Service,
January 22, 1940; *Pius XII and Peace*, p. 45.

Pope Pius XII: Christmas Message, December 24, 1940

.

Exactly one year ago, Venerable Brothers and Beloved Sons, in this very place We formulated certain principles with regard to essential presuppositions of peace which would conform to principles of justice, equity and honor and would thus be enduring. And if the succeeding march of events has delayed their application to a more distant time, the thoughts then proposed have nevertheless lost none of their intrinsic truth and conformity to reality, nor of their force of moral obligation.

From the impassioned polemics of warring factions concerning the objectives of the war and the ultimate peace settlements, there emerges, ever more clearly defined, the quasi-universal opinion which contends that pre-war Europe as well as its political structure are now undergoing a process of transformation of such nature as to signal the dawn of a new era.

Europe and its system of states, it is said, will not be as they were before. Something new and better, more evolved organically, sounder, freer and stronger, must replace the past in order to eliminate its defects, its weaknesses and its deficiencies, which are said to have been disclosed convincingly by recent events.

In the midst of the contrasting systems which are part of our times and dependent upon them, the Church cannot be called upon to favor one more than another. In the orbit of universal value the Divine Law, whose authority obliges not only individuals but nations as well, there is ample room and liberty of action for the most varied forms of political opinion; whilst the practical application of one political system or another depends in a large measure and often quite decisively upon circumstances and causes which considered in themselves are extraneous to the purpose and action of the Church.

As protectress and herald of the principles of faith and morals, it is her sole interest, her sole longing, to convey through educational and religious channels to all peoples without exception the clear waters of the fountains of Our patrimony and values of Christian life, in order that every people in its own peculiar way may enjoy Christian fellowship, Christian ethical-religious impulses to establish a society that would be humanly praiseworthy and spiritually elevated and a source of genuine good.

Indispensable prerequisites for the search for a new order are:

One, triumph over hate, which is today a cause of division among peoples; renunciation therefore of the systems and practices from which hate constantly received added nourishment.

Two, triumph over mistrust, which bears down as a depressing weight on international law and renders impossible the realization of any sincere agreement.

Three, triumph over the distressing principles that utility is a basis of law and right, and that might makes right: a principle which makes all international relations liable to fall.

Four, triumph over those germs of conflict which consist in two-sided differences in the field of world economy; hence progressive action, balanced by correspondent degrees, to arrive at arrangements which would give to every state the medium necessary for insuring the proper standard of living for its own citizens of every rank.

Five, triumph over the spirit of cold egoism, which, fearless in its might, easily leads to violation not only of the honor and sovereignty of states but of the righteous, wholesome and disciplined liberty of citizens as well.

It must be supplanted by sincere juridical and economic solidarity, fraternal collaboration in accordance with the precepts of Divine Law amongst peoples assured of their autonomy and independence.

As long as the rumble of armaments continues in the stark reality of this war, it is scarcely possible to expect any definite acts in the direction of the restoration of morally, juridically imprescriptible rights.

But it would be well to wish that henceforth a declaration of principle in favor of their recognition may be given, to calm the agitation and bitterness of so many who feel that they are menaced or injured in their very existence or in the free development of their activity.

We express Our heartfelt wish that humanity and those who will show it the way along which it is to move forward will be sufficiently matured intellectually and capable in action to prepare the ground of the future for the new order that will be solid, true and just.

N.C.W.C. News Service, Washington.

Pope Pius XII: Broadcast Commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the Encyclical "Rerum Novarum" of Pope Leo XIII, June 1, 1941

.
... These three fundamental values, which are closely connected one with the other, mutually complementary and dependent, are: the use of material goods, labor and the family.

... principles which have lost nothing of their inherent vigor with the passage of time and today, fifty years after, strike their roots deeper and retain their innate vitality.

In Our Encyclical *Sertum Laetitiae*, directed to the Bishops of the United States of America, We called the attention of all to the basic idea of those principles which consists, as We said, in the assertion of the unquestionable need "that the goods which were created by God for all men should flow equally to all, according to the principles of justice and charity."

Every man as a living being gifted with reason, has in fact from nature the fundamental right to make use of the material goods of the earth, while it is left to the will of man and to the juridical statutes of nations to regulate in greater detail the actuation of this right. This individual right cannot in any way be suppressed even by other clear and undisputed rights over material goods. Undoubtedly the natural order, deriving from God, demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and gift, as well as the functioning of the State as a control over all these institutions. All this remains subordinated to the natural scope of material goods and cannot emancipate itself from the first and fundamental right which concedes their use to all men, but it should rather serve to make possible the actuation of this right in conformity with its scope. Only thus can we and must we secure that private property and the use of material goods bring to society peace and prosperity and long life, that they no longer set up

precarious conditions which will give rise to struggles and jealousies and which are left to the mercy of the blind interplay of force and weakness.

The native right to the use of material goods, intimately linked as it is with the dignity and other rights of the human person, together with the statutes mentioned above, provides man with a secure, material basis of the highest import on which to rise to the fulfillment, with reasonable liberty, of his moral duties. . . .

To safeguard the inviolable sphere of the rights of the human person and to facilitate the fulfillment of his duties should be the essential office of every public authority. Does not this flow from that genuine concept of the common good which the State is called upon to promote? Hence, it follows that the care of such a common good does not supply a power so extensive over the members of the community that, in virtue of it, the public authority can interfere with the evolution of that individual activity which We have just described, decide on the beginning or the ending of human life, determine at will the manner of man's physical, spiritual, religious and moral movements in opposition to the personal duties or rights of man, and, to this end, abolish or deprive of efficacy his natural right to material goods.

.

From this, beloved children, it will be easy for you to conclude that the economic riches of a people do not properly consist in the abundance of goods measured according to a purely and solely material calculation of their worth, but in the fact that such an abundance represents and offers, really and effectively, the material basis sufficient for the proper personal development of its members. If such a distribution of goods were not secured, or were effected only imperfectly, the real scope of national economy would not be attained; for although there were at hand a lucky abundance of goods to dispose of, the people, in not being called upon to share them, would not be economically rich, but poor. Suppose, on the other hand, that such a distribution is effected genuinely and permanently, and you will see a people, even if it disposes of less goods, making itself economically sound.

These fundamental concepts regarding the riches and poverty of people it seems to Us particularly opportune to set before you today, when there is a tendency to measure and judge such riches and poverty by balance sheets and purely quantitative criteria of the need or the abundance of goods. If, instead, the scope of the national economy is correctly considered, then it will become a guide for the efforts of statesmen and peoples, and will enlighten them to walk spontaneously along a way which does

not call for continual exaction in goods and blood, but will give fruits of peace and general welfare

With the use of material goods, you yourselves, dear children, see how labor is connected. The *Rerum Novarum* teaches that there are two essential characteristics of human labor; it is personal, and it is necessary. It is personal because it is achieved through the exercise of man's particular forces. It is necessary because without it one cannot procure what is indispensable to life; and man has a natural, grave, individual obligation to maintain life. To the personal duty to labor imposed by nature corresponds and follows the natural right of each individual to make of labor the means to provide for his own life and that of his children; so profoundly is the empire of nature ordained for the preservation of man.

But note that such a duty and the corresponding right to work is imposed on and conceded to the individual in the first instance by nature and not by society as if man were nothing more than a mere slave or official of the community. From that it follows that the duty and the right to organize the labor of the people belongs above all to the people immediately interested: the employers and the workers. If they do not fulfill their functions, or cannot because of special extraordinary emergencies fulfill them, then it falls back on the State to intervene in the field of labor and in the division and distribution of work according to the form and measure that the common good, properly understood, demands.

In any case every legitimate and beneficial interference of the State in the field of labor should be such as to safeguard and respect its personal character, both in the broad outlines and, as far as possible, in what concerns its execution. And this will happen if the norm of the State do not abolish or render impossible the exercise of other rights and duties equally personal; such as the rights to give God His due worship; the right to marry; the right of husband and wife, of father and mother, to lead a married domestic life; the right to a reasonable liberty in the choice of a state of life and the fulfillment of a true vocation, a personal right, this last, if there ever was one, belonging to the spirit and sublime when the higher imprescriptible right of God and of the Church meet as in the choice and fulfillment of the priestly and religious vocations.

According to the teaching of *Rerum Novarum*, nature itself has closely joined private property with the existence of human society and its true civilization, and in a very special manner with the existence and development of the family. Such a link appears more than obvious. Should not private property secure for the father of a family the healthy liberty he

needs in order to fulfill the duties assigned to him by the Creator regarding the physical, spiritual and religious welfare of the family?

In the family the nation finds the natural and fecund roots of its greatness and power. If private property has to conduce to the good of the family, all public standards, and specially those of the State which regulate its possession, must not only make possible and preserve such a function in the natural order under certain aspects superior to all others, but must also perfect it evermore.

A so-called civil progress would in fact be unnatural which — either through the excessive burdens imposed or through exaggerated direct interference — were to render private property void of significance, practically taking from the family and its head the freedom to follow the scope set by God for the perfection of family life.

Of all the goods that can be the object of private property, none is more conformable to nature, according to the teaching of the *Rerum Novarum*, than the land, the holding in which the family lives, and from the products of which it draws all or part of its subsistence. And it is in the spirit of the *Rerum Novarum* to state that, as a rule, only that stability which is rooted in one's own holding makes of the family the vital and most perfect and fecund cell of society, joining up, in a brilliant manner, in its progressive cohesion the present and future generations. If today the concept and the creation of vital spaces is at the center of social and political aims, should not one, before all else, think of the vital space of the family and free it of the fetters of conditions which do not permit even to formulate the idea of a homestead of one's own?

Our planet, with all its extent of oceans and seas and lakes, with mountains and plains covered with eternal snows and ice, with great deserts and tractless lands, is not at the same time, without habitable regions and vital spaces now abandoned to wild natural vegetation and well suited to be cultivated by man to satisfy his needs and civil activities; and more than once, it is inevitable that some families migrating from one spot to another should go elsewhere in search of a new homeland. Then according to the teaching of the *Rerum Novarum*, the right of the family to a vital space is recognized. When this happens, emigration attains its natural scope as experience often shows; we mean the more favorable distribution of men on the earth's surface suitable to colonies of agricultural workers; that surface which God created and prepared for the use of all. If the two parties, those who agree to leave their native land and those who agree to admit the newcomers, remain anxious to eliminate, as far as possible, all obstacles to the birth and growth of real confidence between the country of emigration and that

of immigration, all those affected by such a transference of people and places will profit by the transaction: the families will receive a plot of ground which will be native land for them in the true sense of the word: the thickly inhabited countries will be relieved and their people will acquire new friends in foreign countries; and the States which receive the emigrants will acquire industrious citizens. In this way the nations which give and those which receive will both contribute to the increased welfare of man and to the progress of human culture.

.
N.C.W.C. News Service, Washington.

Pope Pius XII: Christmas Message, December 24, 1941

.

Now the destruction brought about by the present war is on so vast a scale that it is imperative that there be not added to it also the further ruin of a frustrated and deluded peace. In order to avoid so great a calamity it is fitting that in the formulation of that peace there should be assured the cooperation, with sincerity of will and energy, with the purpose of a generous participation not only of this or that party, not only of this or that people, but of all people, yea, rather of all humanity. It is a universal undertaking for the common good which requires the collaboration of all Christendom in the religious and moral aspects of the new edifice that is to be constructed.

.

Such a new order, which all peoples desire to see brought into being after the trials and the ruins of this war, must be founded on that immovable and unshakable rock, the moral law which the Creator Himself has manifested by means of the natural order and which He has engraved with indelible characters in the hearts of men: that moral law whose observance must be inculcated and fostered by the public opinion of all nations and of all States with such a unanimity of voice and energy that no one may dare to call into doubt or weaken its binding force.

.

Within the limits of a new order founded on moral principles there is no room for the violation of the freedom, integrity, and security of other States, no matter what may be their territorial extension or their capacity for defense. If it is inevitable that the powerful States should, by reason of their greater potentialities and their power, play leading

roles in the formation of economic groups comprising not only themselves but also smaller and weaker States as well, it is, nevertheless, indispensable that in the interests of the common good they, as all others, respect the rights of those smaller States to political freedom, to economic development and to the adequate protection, in the case of conflicts between nations, of that neutrality which is theirs according to the natural, as well as international, law.

.

Within the limits of a new order founded on moral principles, there is no place for open or occult oppression of the cultural and linguistic characteristics of national minorities, for the hindrance or restriction of their economic resources, for the limitation or abolition of their natural fertility. The more conscientiously the government of the State respects the rights of minorities, the more confidently and the more effectively can it demand from its subjects a loyal fulfillment of those civil obligations which are common to all citizens.

Within the limits of a new order founded on moral principles, there is no place for that cold and calculating egoism which tends to hoard the economic resources and materials destined for the use of all to such an extent that the nations less favored by nature are not permitted access to them. In this regard, it is for us a source of great consolation to see admitted the necessity of a participation of all in the natural riches of the earth, even on the part of those nations which in the fulfilment of this principle belong to the category of "givers" and not to that of "receivers." It is, however, in conformity with the principles of equity that the solution to a question so vital to the world economy should be arrived at methodically and in easy stages, with the necessary guarantees, drawing useful lessons from the omissions and mistakes of the past.

If, in the future peace, this point were not to be courageously dealt with, there would remain in the relations between peoples a deep and far-reaching root, blossoming forth into bitter dissensions and burning jealousies, and which would lead eventually to new conflicts. It must, however, be noted how closely the satisfactory solution to this problem is connected with another fundamental point which we shall treat next.

Within the limit of a new order founded on moral principles, once the more dangerous sources of armed conflicts have been eliminated, there is no place for a total warfare or for a mad rush to armaments. The calamity of a world war, with the economic and social ruin and the moral dissolution and breakdown which follow in its trail, should not be permitted to envelop the human race for a third time.

In order that mankind be preserved from such a misfortune it is essential to proceed with sincerity and honesty to a progressive limitation of armaments. The lack of equilibrium between the exaggerated armaments of the powerful States and the limited armaments of the weaker ones is a menace to harmony and peace among nations and demands that an ample and proportionate limit be placed upon production and possession of offensive weapons in proportion to the degree in which disarmament is effected.

Means must be found which will be appropriate, honorable, and efficacious in order that the norm "pacts must be observed" will once again enjoy its vital and moral function in the juridical relations between States.

Such a norm has undergone many serious crises and has suffered undeniable violations in the past and has met with an incurable lack of trust among the various nations and among their respective rulers. To procure the rebirth of mutual trust, certain institutions must be established which will merit the respect of all and which will dedicate themselves to the most noble office of guaranteeing the sincere observance of treaties and of promoting, in accordance with the principles of law and equity, necessary corrections and revisions of such treaties.

.

Within the limits of a new order founded on moral principles, there is no place for the persecution of religion and of the Church. From a lively faith in a personal and transcendent God, there springs a sincere and unyielding moral strength which informs the whole course of life; for faith is not only a virtue, it is also the divine gate by which all the virtues enter the temple of the soul and it constitutes that strong and tenacious character which does not falter before the rigid demands of reason and justice.

.

N.C.W.C. News Service, Washington; *International Conciliation*, February 1942, No. 377.

Pope Pius XII: Plea Broadcast to Warring Nations on His Episcopal Silver Jubilee, May 13, 1942

. . . Our conscience is Our witness that from the moment when the hidden designs of God entrusted to our feeble strength the weight, now so heavy, of the Supreme Pontificate We have labored both before the outbreak of war and during its course for peace, with all Our mind and strength and within the ambit of Our apostolic ministry. But now when

the nations are living in the painful suspense of waiting for new engagements to begin, We take the opportunity offered by this occasion to speak once again a word of peace; and We speak that word in the full consciousness of our absolute impartiality towards all the belligerents and with equal affection for all peoples without exception.

We know well how in the present state of affairs the formulation of specific proposals of a just and equitable peace would not have any well-founded probability of success — indeed every time that one speaks a word of peace one runs the risk of offending the one or other side.

In fact, while one side bases its security on the results obtained, the other rests its hopes on future battles. If, however, the present lining up of forces, of gains and losses in the political and military sphere, does not show any immediate practical possibility of peace, the destruction wrought by the war among the nations in the material and spiritual plane is all the time accumulating to such an extent that it calls for every effort to prevent its increase by bringing the conflict to a speedy end.

Even prescinding from arbitrary acts of violence and cruelty — against which, on former occasions We raised Our voice in warning; and We repeat that warning now with insistent supplication — even in the face of threats of still more deadly warfare, the war of itself, through the perfect technical quality of its weapons, causes unheard of pain, misery and suffering to the nations. Our thoughts are with the courageous combatants, with the multitudes that are living in the zones of operations in occupied countries or within their own countries.

We think — how could We not think — of the dead, of the millions of prisoners, of the mothers, wives, sons who for all their love of their country are prey to mortal anguish. We think of the separation of married people, of the breakdown of family life, of famine and economic penury. Does not each of these names of evil and ruin connote a numberless group of disheartening cases in which is epitomized and condensed the most lamentable, bitter, excruciating phenomenon ever turned loose on humanity and make Us fearful of a near future full of terrible unknown economic and social hardships?

.

We should like, then, to address a fatherly word of warning to the rulers of nations. The family is sacred; it is the cradle not only of children but also of the nation — of its force and its glory. Do not let

the family be alienated or diverted from the high purpose assigned to it by God. God wills that husband and wife, in loyal fulfillment of their duties to one another and to the family, should in the home transmit to the next generation the torch of corporal life and with it spiritual and moral life. Christian life; that within the family, under the care of their parents, there should grow up men of straight character, of upright behavior, to become valuable unspoiled members of the human race, manly in good or bad fortune, obedient to those who command them and to God. That is the will of the Creator.

Do not let the family home, and with it the school, become merely an anteroom to the battlefield. Do not let the husband and wife become separated from one another in a permanent manner. Do not let the children be separated from the watchful care of their parents over their bodies and souls. Do not let the earnings and the savings of the family become void of all fruit.

The cry that reaches Us from the family front is unanimous: "Give us back our peace-time occupations." If one has the future of mankind at heart, if your conscience before God ascribes some import to what the names father and mother mean to men and to what makes for the real happiness of your children, send back the family to its peacetime occupation.

As patron of this family front — from which may God keep far all open ways of unfortunate and disastrous upheaval — We make a warm, fatherly appeal to statesmen that they may not let any occasion pass, that may open up to the nations the road to an honest peace of justice and moderation, to a peace arising from a free and fruitful agreement, even if it should not correspond in all points to their aspirations.

.

Let us rekindle in ourselves the spirit of love; let us hold ourselves ever ready to collaborate with our faith and our hands, after the most extensive, disastrous and bloody cataclysm of all history, to reconstruct from the pile of material and moral ruins a world which the bonds of brotherly love will weld in peace, a world in which, with the help of the Almighty, all may be new hearts, words and works.

.

Pope Pius XII: Christmas Message, December 24, 1942

... International equilibrium and harmony depend on the internal equilibrium and development of the individual States in the material, social and intellectual spheres. A firm and steady peace policy toward other nations is, in fact, impossible without a spirit of peace within the nation which inspires trust. It is only, then, by striving for an integral peace, a peace in both fields, that people will be freed from the cruel nightmare of war, and the material and psychological causes of further discord and disorder will be diminished and gradually eliminated

Every society, worthy of the name, has originated in a desire for peace, and hence aims at attaining peace, that "tranquil living together in order" in which St. Thomas finds the essence of peace.

Two primary elements, then, regulate social life. A living together in order and a living together in tranquility.

... We exhort you with suppliant, paternal insistence not only to realize fully the dreadful gravity of this hour, but also to meditate upon the vistas of good and supernatural benefit which it opens up, and to unite and collaborate toward the renewal of society in spirit and truth.

The essential aim of this necessary and holy crusade is that the Star of Peace, the Star of Bethlehem, may shine out again over the whole of mankind in all its brilliant splendor and reassuring consolation as a pledge and augury of a better, more fruitful and happier future.

It is true that the road from night to full day will be long: but of decisive importance are the first steps on the path, the first five milestones of which bear chiselled on them the following maxims:

1. Dignity and rights of the human person.
2. Defense of Social Unity and Especially of the Family in Principle.
3. Dignity and Prerogatives of Labor.
4. The Rehabilitation of Juridic Order.
5. The Conception of the State According to the Christian Spirit.

N.C.W.C. News Service, Washington.

2. THE UNITED STATES

National Conference of Leaders Representing Various Religious Groups in the United States, Called by the Department of International Justice and Goodwill of the Federal Council of Churches: Message, Philadelphia, February 1940

.

It must now be clear that no nation has a right to be a law unto itself, or the sole judge of its own cause. If the peace which comes after the present war is to be anything more than a prelude to another conflict, the United States for its own sake and for the sake of humanity will have to renounce its political and economic isolation and identify itself with other nations in the creation of a world government. Only then will we be freed from the burdens of power politics. . . .

We call upon our people to mobilize the spiritual resources of our churches in support of an international system of government. This is not to say that nations can have no place in a Christian world order. Diversity of culture and manners among various peoples enriches the world society. A Christian world order does not presuppose the elimination of differences among peoples. What is required is that nation-states no less than individuals shall be made subject to a world system of law, and to a sense of mutual responsibility.

The churches, which in themselves transcend national frontiers, have a peculiar responsibility to help expand men's loyalties to include the whole number of the children of our Heavenly Father, and the world government required by their common needs.

A political world community could not of itself secure international good will and peace. Economic injustice, no less than political anarchy, breeds war. No system of world government which does not facilitate the easing of economic tension-points can vouchsafe peace to the world. If a permanent peace is to follow the present era of military hostilities, nations will have to renounce the practice of economic warfare. Reparations, embargoes, trade and currency restrictions, quotas and tariffs, no less than cannon and bombing planes, are potential instruments of war. These, too, must be renounced if peace, with justice, is to prevail.

It is neither right nor just that a few nations should own or control or exercise political domination over the wealth of the world. It is probably not too much to say that half of the world exists below the

subsistence level. This is not because there is any lack of raw materials or of the good things of life. It is because economic nationalism, no less than political nationalism, has bedeviled the relations of nations. The result is that the peoples which possess the preponderance of the world's wealth project armies and navies to maintain their privileged position while at the same time the less fortunate nations employ force or the threat of force to secure for themselves a more equitable share of the world's wealth.

We support the following recommendations of the Washington Conference on World Economic Cooperation convened by the National Peace Conference which call for (a) improving the standards of labor and living by international agreement as is being done by the International Labor Organization, (b) access to raw materials on equal terms, (c) freer access to markets so nations may be able to sell that which they best produce in order to have the exchange with which to purchase raw materials, (d) trading on a basis of equality rather than discrimination, (e) currency stabilization and better coordination of financial policies, (f) an autonomous International Economic Organization similar in structure and function to the International Labor Organization and which would have as its purpose the easing of economic tension points and the development of a world economy in the interest of peace and justice.

We recognize that the close causal relationship existing between unemployment, dire economic need and war is both of domestic and international significance. We, therefore, express the conviction that the Church in its efforts to abolish war should stress all effective means, both domestic and international, whereby basic economic needs may be met and a more equitable distribution of economic goods achieved.

We concur in the judgment of the Geneva Conference, 1939,¹ that "the task of colonial government . . . must be regarded as a common task of mankind, to be carried out in the interests of the colonial people by the most appropriate form of organization." We believe that the principle of eventual freedom for all peoples is not only the recognition of an essential right but is also a prerequisite to the creation of that sense of justice and good will without which we cannot hope to rid the world of war.

Text published by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York.

¹ Conference called by the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, July 1939.

Board of Directors of the American Friends Service Committee: Statement, Philadelphia, June 1941

... peace is a dynamic method, by which to remove injustices, to accomplish necessary readjustments, and to remedy, instead of aggravating, the evils that have been inflicted on the world by military aggression. Dynamic peace would include:

1. Acceptance of the principle that it is a distinct disadvantage for any nation or people to use military force for its own ends; and that national armed forces shall be reduced with a view to universal disarmament.
2. Acceptance of the principle of peaceful third-party settlement of all disputes not settled by mutually satisfactory direct negotiations.
3. Acceptance of the principle that all peoples shall be free to develop their own cultures; and that each nation shall be free to develop the form of government which its people desire.
4. Acceptance of the principle that economic and social policies which affect other nations or peoples must be determined in international consultation, under international authority.
5. Acceptance of the principle that all nations should be assured equitable access to markets and to essential raw materials, and should control immigration and emigration with a view to the welfare of all the nations concerned.
6. Acceptance of the principle that all colonies must be administered by an international authority, with the welfare and development toward self-government of the native inhabitants as the primary objective and providing equitable opportunity of access for all nations to the resources and trade of such colonies.

These principles require the development of some form of international organization capable of providing both order and change in the relations among nations. As a step toward such world government, it is desirable to propose the immediate establishment of an international emergency commission, to deal at once with the problems sure to become urgent as soon as the war stops. These problems include: (1) Famine and pestilence; (2) Demobilization and re-employment; (3) The maintenance of order in countries now under foreign military rule; (4) The establishment of a provisional international secretariat with which governments can cooperate in directing their own emergency efforts along lines consistent with world organization and dynamic peace.

Friends Peace Committee, Philadelphia, Pa.

*Central Conference of American Rabbis: Program for World Reconstruction, June 24-29, 1941*¹

. . . Towards the abolition of war and the establishment of permanent and enduring peace, we urge the following program.

A. The extension to all peoples of the earth the opportunity for democracy. Men will never accept slavery, and freedom is the heart of human dignity. The totalitarian state cannot be tolerated. Tyranny of every form must be destroyed. Any state which denies to human beings the right to self-government, which exalts the state above the individual and man above God, cannot endure.

B. The development of facilities for transportation and communication, especially of the airplane and the radio, have shrunk the world and have brought peoples more closely together. In such a world greater international cooperation has become imperative. Such cooperation could best be effected through some international organization. The League of Nations was a good experiment in that direction. It was wrecked by nationalistic power-politics. The welfare of future generations demands the creation of some parliament of nations which will adjust the differences between nations and create agencies for cooperative enterprises.

C. The laws of such a parliament of nations could be enforced through the establishment of an international police force, to be used to restrain aggressor or outlaw nations. The establishment of such a police force would make national armaments unnecessary and would make universal disarmament practicable.

D. The Prophet Micah recognized that swords can only be beaten into ploughshares "when every man shall sit under his vine and fig tree and none shall make them afraid." Our age too must recognize this. The widespread unemployment of men able and willing to work, the unnecessarily low standards of living, the specter of economic insecurity, the fear of impoverished old age, the inability to secure available medical treatment, the blight of child labor, and other similar social evils, create hostilities and hatreds which mar human life and jeopardize the peace of all men. Social justice for every individual must be the cornerstone on which the structure of world peace is erected.

¹ See also the statement of February 1942, entitled *This War and the Peace Tradition of Judaism*.

One of the few statements on the post-war situation of Jews was issued by a Conference of Representatives of the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain and Ireland, held in Edinburgh, January 1942. For text see *Contemporary Jewish Record*, V, 3, p. 367.

E. International cooperation must not be merely political. It must also be economic. The raw materials of the world must be available to all the children of men who need them. Nations must cease to regard each other as hostile competitors. The economy of the world must be reorganized on the basis of friendly cooperation between all nations and races and the recognition of the sacred rights and privileges of every individual.

Contemporary Jewish Record, V, 2, p. 201-2.

***Catholic Association for International Peace: Report of Several Committees, Washington, 1941*¹**

I. OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Responsibility. When this war can end, the United States must try to secure a just and charitable peace. . . . The peace must be more than an armistice. It must help to create a new and better era. . . .

II. A UNITED EUROPE

European Union. Some kind of voluntary European union is a primary need. . . .

The Rights of Man. First, the rights of man and of peoples must be defined and recognized, and an institutional way established to ensure human rights . . . respect for which should be secured not only by European union but by world union as well.

National Autonomy. Within a united Europe the principle of local and national autonomy can and must be established, and a way can and must be found to form regional groupings and redraw the lines of autonomy as the facts change.

European Economic Organization. Unless Europe organizes its economic life, unemployment, poverty, crisis and war will be permanent. A mere customs union is insufficient for a continent so dependent on outside resources and markets, so industrially and commercially developed and so unequally developed. All the rules of economic morality must be enforced through proper organization and institutions.

The totalitarian states organize and direct economy; but Catholic social teaching proposes a free self-directed economy, in which free organizations of the industries and professions, labor unions included, cooperate with one another and with government. . . .

¹ *The World Society*, The Second Roman Catholic report, is a statement of the principles and foundations of a just peace in the light of Catholic theology and morality. It is the philosophical basis of the proposals for world and regional government set forth in *America's Peace Aims*.

Colonies. Europe's great mission of colonizing, Christianizing and civilizing has been injured by disunion; indeed the nationalistic performance of this mission helped to cause disunion. Yet, even now, the mission can be a bond of union, specifically in the administration of the African colonies.

For obvious reasons Europe's dominions or approximate dominions should not be brought politically closer to Europe; and its American and Asiatic colonies are also of interest to other continents and to the whole world. But the African colonies are a responsibility which Europe may be able to handle by itself in collaboration with world organization.

It is, therefore, proposed that the real colonies in Africa, or a considerable number thereof, be transferred to a united Europe under world supervision — perhaps with a mandate system of administration, and certainly with general rights of access to resources and markets, and with the guarantee of the rights of the native populations.

III. WORLD ORGANIZATION . . . is needed to gain the well-being of the world. . . .

IV. FUNCTIONS AND FORMS

World Organization and Europe. In relation to a voluntarily united Europe, a world organization should be primarily an appeals and review body. For some time also it should furnish Europe positive assistance in protecting human rights, redrawing boundaries, administering the colonies of Africa and guiding economic life. Permanently, a world organization will have to cooperate with a united Europe in world economic life and the prevention of European war.

World Organization and the World. In these same matters there is need of world organization for activities of a world-wide character. It is needed specifically to watch over the colonies in Asia and the Americas, provide mandates and correct the colonial situation in the Far East; to expedite transfer of population singly or in mass; to protect ordinary human freedom; to guide economic life and prevent war.

World Economic Organization. A world economic organization working together with world governmental organization is needed for post-war rehabilitation and for permanent guidance of world economic life. For the permanent purpose such an organization was proposed by committees of this Association in 1933. The form urged was similar to that of the International Labor Organization — participation by employers, labor (and, in this case, farmers) and government — with the employer, labor and farmer representatives coming from the free organizations of these groups.

In the performance of its function to guide world economic life for the good of the world, the world economic organization would deal with tariffs, credit, monetary policies, access to markets, resources and areas of settlement, quantity of production, development of underdeveloped areas, labor standards, price parities, the destruction of economic nationalism and imperialism and the right distribution of wealth and income.

A break with the economic practices of the past is asked. It cannot be a sharp break when many countries may still want totalitarian governments and many others may want to retain customary systems. Over and over again and patiently the attempt must continually be made to end in this way the unemployment, poverty and economic strains that cause war.

.
APPENDIX C. AN INTERNATIONAL BILL OF RIGHTS BY
REV. WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.
.

VIII. The right of small nations that the demands, even legitimate, of larger nations yield before the claims of an organic order which respects the equality of all nations.

IX. The right of all peoples to require, as a matter of international concern, that all associated states respect the following individual rights:

the right of freedom of conscience and of worship before the State;

the right of freedom of expression within the law;

the right of free association, of free assembly, and of free petition of grievances;

the right of private property; and of being secure against unlawful seizures and confiscations;

the right of freedom of education according to the wishes of the parent;

the right to be tried according to the law and to be secure against cruel and unusual punishments;

the right of ethnic and religious minorities to enjoy equal opportunities for the development of their common humanity.

.
America's Peace Aims, Catholic Association for International
Peace, Washington.

***National Conference of Christians and Jews: Statement Signed by
Leading Protestants, Catholics and Jews, February 1942***

We believe that God's fatherly providence extends equally to every human being. We reject theories of race which affirm the essential

superiority of one racial strain over another. We acknowledge every man as our brother. We respect and champion his inalienable rights, and are determined to do all in our power to promote man's temporal and spiritual welfare as necessary consequences of our duty to God.

We believe the republican form of government to be the most desirable for our nation and for countries of similarly democratic traditions. Any political forms, however, can bring liberty and happiness to a society only when moral and religious principles are accepted and practiced.

We believe, with the founders of this republic, that individual rights are an endowment from God, and we reject, as certain to result in the enslavement of man, all denials of this principle.

National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York.

*The Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace*¹
Instituted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America: Message of the National Study Conference, Delaware, Ohio, March 3-5, 1942

III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. WE BELIEVE that moral law, no less than physical law, undergirds our world. . . . If mankind is to escape chaos and recurrent war, social and political institutions must be brought into conformity with this moral order.

2. . . . that the sickness and suffering which afflict our present society are proof of indifference to, as well as direct violation of, the moral law. All share in responsibility for the present evils. . . .

3. . . . that it is contrary to the moral order that nations in their dealings with one another should be motivated by a spirit of revenge and retaliation. Such attitudes will lead, as they always have led, to renewed conflict.

4. . . . that the principle of cooperation and mutual concern, implicit in the moral order and essential to a just and durable peace, call for a true community of nations. . . . The interdependent life of nations must be ordered by agencies having the duty and the power to promote and safeguard the general welfare of all peoples. . . .

5. . . . that economic security is no less essential than political security to a just and durable peace. Such security nationally and internationally involves among other things the use of material resources and the tools of production to raise the general standard of living. . . .

¹ Established in December 1940.

6. . . . that international machinery is required to facilitate the easing of such economic and political tensions as are inevitably recurrent in a world which is living and therefore changing. . . .

7. . . . that that government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed is the truest expression of the rights and dignity of man. This requires that we seek autonomy for all subject and colonial peoples. Until that shall be realized the task of colonial government is no longer one of exclusive national concern. . . .

8. . . . that military establishments should be internationally controlled and be made subject to law under the community of nations. For one or more nations to be forcibly deprived of their arms while other nations retain the right of maintaining or expanding their military establishments can only produce an uneasy peace for a limited period. Any initial arrangement which falls short of this must therefore be looked upon as temporary and provisional.

9. . . . that the right of all men to pursue work of their own choosing and to enjoy security from want and oppression is not limited by race, color or creed. . . .

10. . . . that in bringing international relations into conformity with the moral law, a very heavy responsibility devolves upon the United States. . . . We must be ready to subordinate immediate and particular national interests to the welfare of all. . . .

11. . . . that a supreme responsibility rests with the Church. . . . Moreover, the Church, which is now in reality a world community, may be used of God to develop His spirit of righteousness and love in every race and nation and thus to make possible a just and durable peace. . . .

12. . . . that as Christian citizens, we must seek to translate our beliefs into practical realities and to create a public opinion which will insure that the United States shall play its full and essential part in the creation of a moral way of international living. . . .

[Here follows a comprehensive statement on the political, economic and social bases of a just and durable peace. A brief digest of points covered is given below.]

V. THE POLITICAL BASES OF A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE

1. The United States must cooperate with other nations.
2. There will be a transitional period of social and economic reestablishment.
3. Certain tasks can only be performed by international authority.
4. Certain powers must thus be delegated to international authority.
5. The kinds of international authority we may set up.
6. International authority over colonies.
7. The influence of the churches on statesmen.

VI. THE ECONOMIC BASES OF A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE

1. Economic distress and conflict prevent spiritual unity and peace.
2. The profit system has proved inadequate.

We would not accept the alternative of state compulsion and loss of personal freedoms. A workable alternative requires more Christian motivation, so that to produce and to render service will seem in themselves worthwhile.

3. We must experiment with various systems — private, cooperative and public.
4. No nation can solve its economic problem alone.

There must be cooperation.

Applications suggested under 3.

Applications suggested under 4.

Resolution approving certain acts of our government evidencing the spirit of economic collaboration.

VII. THE SOCIAL BASES OF A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE

1. The peace settlement should reflect the brotherhood of man and certain basic individual rights.
2. There must be works of mercy.
3. A world community must still preserve national and folk cultural values.
4. There must be justice to all racial groups. This for us means particularly abandonment of discrimination against negroes.

Message from the National Study Conference on the Churches and a Just and Durable Peace, issued by the Commission . . . , 1942, p. 4-5, 10-14.

Catholic Archbishops and Bishops: Statement of Victory and Peace, Issued by the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, November 14, 1942

. . . While war is the last means to which a nation should resort, circumstances arise when it is impossible to avoid it. At times it is the positive duty of a nation to wage war in the defense of life and right. Our country now finds itself in such circumstances.

Even while we meet here, the exigencies of war have driven our armed forces into unexpected areas of conflict in Africa. Our President in letters addressed to the rulers of all the friendly nations concerned has given solemn assurance that the United States has no designs of permanent conquest or sordid interest.

Our aim, he pledged, is to guarantee to countries under temporary occupation as well as to our own the right to live in security and peace.

We Bishops are confident that the pledge of our Chief Executive, not lightly made, faithfully mirrors the mind and conscience of the American people.

That pledge is in full harmony with the expression of high purpose which the President made to the Catholic Bishops of the United States when our own country was plunged into war:

"We shall win this war and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations."

.

In the discharge of our pastoral responsibility we are gravely concerned about the world peace of tomorrow.

Secularism cannot write a real and lasting peace. Its narrow vision does not encompass the whole man, it cannot evaluate the spirituality of the human soul and the supreme good of all mankind

Exploitation cannot write a real and lasting peace. Where greedy might and selfish expediency are made the substitutes of justice there can be no securely ordered world.

Totalitarianism, whether Nazi, Communist or Fascist, cannot write a real and lasting peace. The State that usurps total powers by that fact becomes a despot to its own people and a menace to the family of nations.

The spirit of Christianity can write a real and lasting peace in justice and charity to all nations, even to those not Christian.

In the epochal revolution through which the world is passing it is very necessary for us to realize that every man is our brother in Christ. All should be convinced that every man is endowed with the dignity of human personality and that he is entitled by the laws of nature to the things necessary to sustain life in a way conformable to human dignity.

In the post-war world the profit element of industry and commerce must be made subservient to the common good of communities and nations if we are to have a lasting peace with justice and a sense of true brotherhood for all our neighbors.

The inequalities of nations and of individuals can never give to governments or to the leaders of industry or commerce a right to be unjust. They cannot, if they follow the fixed principles of morality, maintain or encourage conditions under which men cannot live according to standards befitting human personality.

Unfortunately, in our day we must wage a global war to secure peace. War is abnormal and necessarily brings on abnormal conditions in the life of a nation.

During the war crisis free men must surrender many of their liberties. We ask our people to be united and prepared to make every sacrifice

which our government deems necessary for a just and enduring peace through the victory of our armed forces.

We are confident that they will perform their wartime duties gladly because they know that our country has been the defender, not the destroyer, of liberties and has in the past always re-established in full measure peacetime freedom, on the conclusion of hostilities. . . .

. . . The war has brought to the fore conditions that have long been with us. The full benefits of our free institutions and the rights of our minorities must be openly acknowledged and honestly respected.

We ask this acknowledgment and respect particularly for our colored fellow-citizens. They should enjoy the full measure of economic opportunities and advantages which will enable them to realize their hope and ambition to join with us in preserving and expanding in changed and changing social conditions our national heritage.

We fully appreciate their many native gifts and aptitudes which, ennobled and enriched by a true Christian life, will make them a powerful influence in the establishment of Christian social order.

We recall the words of Pope Pius XII expressing his paternal solicitude for the colored people of our country. In a letter addressed to the American Bishops on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the American hierarchy, His Holiness said:

"We confess that we feel a special paternal affection which is certainly inspired of Heaven for the Negro people dwelling among you; for in the field of religion and education we know that they need special care and comfort and are very deserving of it. We, therefore, invoke an abundance of heavenly blessing and we pray fruitful success for those whose generous zeal is devoted to their welfare" (*Sertum Laetitiae* — 1939).

We send our cordial greetings to our brother Bishops of Latin America. We have been consoled by recent events, which give a sincere promise of a better understanding by our country of the peoples of Mexico, Central and South America.

Citizens of these countries are bound to us by the closest bonds of religion. They are not merely our neighbors: they are our brothers professing the same faith. Every effort made to rob them of their Catholic religion or to ridicule it or to offer them a substitute for it is deeply resented by the peoples of these countries and by American Catholics. These efforts prove to be a disturbing factor in our international relations.

The traditions, the spirit, the background, the culture of these countries are Catholic. We Bishops are anxious to foster every worthy movement which will strengthen our amicable relations with the republics of this continent.

We express the hope that the mistakes of the past which were offensive to the dignity of our Southern brothers, their culture and their religion will not continue. A strong bond uniting in true friendship all the countries of the Western Hemisphere will exercise a most potent influence on a shattered post-war world.

We urge the serious study of the peace plans of Pope Pius XII which insist that justice be inspired by love — first, love of God and, then, love of every human being. "The command of love among individuals found in the Gospels," said Benedict XV, "differs in no respect from that which should reign among States and peoples" (*Pacem Dei*, Benedict XV, 1920). If we are not to have a Christian peace, then we shall be given only an armistice and we shall begin to prepare for a third world conflict. . . .

N.Y.T., November 15, 1942; also N.C.W.C. News Service, Washington.

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America: Statement of Guiding Principles Adopted at Cleveland, Ohio, December 11, 1942

[For text, see p. 634.]

3. GREAT BRITAIN

His Eminence Arthur Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster: Broadcast by the British Broadcasting Corporation, December 10, 1939

.

Resurrection is by the return of the spirit. All we who bear the Christian name, who enjoy the religious freedom of the country in which we dwell, owe our prayers from the heart for our brethren in less happy lands that they may rise again in the Peace of Christ.

And we too have need of a return of the spirit to newness of life, if we aspire to take our due part in the renewal or resurrection of Europe. Those rules and canons of morality, which have been obscured in the prevailing darkness, should be made to shine more brightly as well on our domestic hearths as in our markets and in our public halls, of council or of entertainment. "It is not from the sword," says Pius XII, "that deliverance must come to the nations; the sword cannot breed peace, it can only impose terms of peace. The forces, the influences that are to renew the face of the earth, must spring from men's hearts."

Among ourselves there should be such searching of hearts as will ensure that personal and social justice shall bring us real peace within our own coasts. As long as selfish regard for private interests overrules

the common good, as long as our fellow men are looked upon by any individual or group as mere cogs in the industrial wheels, so long that peace which is the fruit of justice tempered with charity will be absent from our shores. The enormous sacrifices we already have to make should not prevent us from striving to secure employment and decent living conditions for all. No victory abroad will compensate for unhappiness and strife at home either now or in the years after the war.

Charity, love of our fellow men in God must be the ever-present guide in the redirection of a world that has gone astray from its Shepherd. And charity should reach out even to those we now call our enemies, for they also are sons of the "One God and Father of us all, who is above all and reaches through all and dwells in all of us."

We implore our merciful Father by the Grace of Christ which changed Saul into Paul, to turn the hearts of His children from hatred and war to brotherhood and harmony.

The Voice of the Churches, p. 21-2.

***The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England:
Statement, December 1939***¹

.

. . . What has shaken the heart of the world is the fact that there are nations that have flagrantly violated this fundamental principle. They have denied to others the right to live their lives in their own way without oppression, and have pursued this policy in a cruel way, trampling upon other people's rights and inflicting on them almost unbelievable suffering.

There is only one mind with us regarding this wrong. All of us are convinced that it must end. One thing is sure — we must not allow hatred against anyone to possess us, not even against those who are now our enemies. The time for making peace will surely come, and there ought to be no place at its council for hatred; for no one who hates can hold the scales of justice level.

With conviction and earnestness we urge upon our Churches, and especially upon the ministers, at this time in the affairs of our nation, to proclaim the central truths of our common faith with the urgency the occasion demands. In this solemn hour we have a great opportunity to establish in many minds the abiding truth that God, through Christ,

¹ For statements of the Church of Scotland, the Anglican Church in Wales, the Churches in Northern Ireland, see *The Voice of the Churches*, p. 23-32.

can remake a wrecked world. There is no real reconciliation possible between men and nations that is not based on the reconciling ministry of God through Jesus Christ. In proclaiming this the Church is rendering the greatest possible service to the world at this hour.

.
The Voice of the Churches, p. 24-5.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Most Rev. Cosmo Gordon Lang: Broadcast by the British Broadcasting Corporation, December 31, 1939

.

And after the war? Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Halifax have repeatedly assured us that we seek no vindictive peace. That does not mean an easy peace, any kind of letting off. In the face of wrongdoing, justice is stern. The punishments which justice inflicts are stern. But there is all the difference between the sternness of justice and the vindictiveness of angry passion. Here again, warned by experience, we may expect strong temptation. Self-restraint will be alike necessary and hard. We must see to it that the high ideals for which we went to war are not forgotten in the peace.

The one safeguard against these temptations which so easily beset us is loyalty to what we may know to be the mind and spirit of Christ the King. That loyalty may make great demands. But if Christians give up their witness, the whole level of the national tone and temper will fall. Rather it is for us to strive and pray that even out of the distress and turmoil of this war the world may take at least one step nearer to the Kingdom of God.

The Voice of the Churches, p. 12-13.

Agreement by the Churches in England: Letter to The Times (London), December 21, 1940

The present evils in the world are due to the failure of nations and peoples to carry out the laws of God. No permanent peace is possible in Europe unless the principles of the Christian religion are made the foundation of national policy and of all social life. This involves regarding all nations as members of one family under the Fatherhood of God.

We accept the 5 points of Pope Pius XII as carrying out this principle (see "The Pope's Five Peace Points," p. 13-16):¹—

¹ See p. 613.

1. The assurance to all nations of their right to life and independence. The will of one nation to live must never mean the sentence of death passed on another. When this equality of rights has been destroyed, attacked or threatened, order demands that reparation shall be made, and the measure and extent of that reparation is determined not by the sword nor by the arbitrary decision of self-interest, but by the rules of justice and reciprocal equity.

2. This requires that the nations be delivered from the slavery imposed upon them by the race for armaments and from the danger that material force, instead of serving to protect the right, may become an overbearing and tyrannical master. The order thus established, requires a mutually agreed organic progressive disarmament, spiritual as well as material, and security for the effective implementing of such an agreement.

3. Some juridical institution which shall guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfillment of conditions agreed upon and which shall in case of recognized need revise and correct them.

4. The real needs and just demands of nations and populations and racial minorities to be adjusted as occasion may require, even where no strictly legal right can be established, and a foundation of mutual confidence to be thus laid, whereby many incentives to violent action will be removed.

5. The development among peoples and their rulers of that sense of deep and keen responsibility which weighs human statutes according to the sacred and inviolable standards of the laws of God. They must hunger and thirst after justice and be guided by that universal love which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal.

With these basic principles for the ordering of international life we would associate five standards by which economic situations and proposals may be tested (see "The Churches Survey Their Task," 11. 116, 117):—

1. Extreme inequality in wealth and possessions should be abolished;
2. Every child, regardless of race or class, should have equal opportunities of education, suitable for the development of his peculiar capacities;
3. The family as a social unit must be safeguarded;
4. The sense of a Divine vocation must be restored to man's daily work;
5. The resources of the earth should be used as God's gifts to the whole human race and used with due consideration for the needs of the present and future generations.

We are confident that the principles we have enumerated would be accepted by rulers and statesmen throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations and would be regarded as the true basis on which a lasting peace could be established.

COSMO CANTUAR: Archbishop of Canterbury

CARDINAL HINSLEY: Archbishop of Westminster

WALTER H. ARMSTRONG: Moderator, Free Church Federal Council

WILLIAM EBOR: Archbishop of York

Information Service, Federal Council of the Churches, New York.

*The Church of England, Unofficial Conference at Malvern College, Convened by the Archbishop of York, Most Rev. William Temple, January 7-10, 1941: Document of Conclusions*¹

.

. . . We believe that the most vital demands to be made by the Church with a view to social reconstruction are two: the restoration of man's economic activity to its proper place as the servant of his whole personal life, and the expression of his status in the natural world as a child of God for whom Christ died.

To this end we urge:

(a) That the monetary system be so administered that what the community can produce is made available to the members of the community, the satisfaction of human needs being accepted as the only true end of production.

(b) Inasmuch as human status ought not to depend upon the changing demands of the economic process, no one should be deprived of the support necessary for "the good life" by the fact that there is at some time no demand for his labor.

(c) This status of man as man, independently of the economic process, must find expression in the managerial framework of industry; the rights of labor must be recognized as in principle equal to those of capital in the control of industry, whatever the means by which this transformation is effected.

¹ See also Statement issued by the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility in Britain, 1941. Published in United States by the Department of the Church and Social Service of the Federal Council of the Churches, New York.

(d) In international trade a genuine interchange of materially needed commodities must take the place of a struggle for a so-called favorable balance.

(e) The Church should strive to keep alive in all men and in all functional groups a sense of vocation by constantly calling upon them to consider what is the purpose of their various activities, and to keep this true to the purpose of God for His people.

(f) In all that is planned, regard must be paid to the family as by God's appointment the basic social unit on whose stability and welfare all other social welfare in large measure depends.

(g) In like manner we must recover reverence for the earth and its resources, treating it no longer as a reservoir of potential wealth to be exploited, but as a storehouse of divine bounty on which we utterly depend. This will carry with it both a deliberate revival of agriculture by securing to the agricultural laborer good wages and to the farmer a secure and just price. We regard this as indispensable to the true balance of the national life.

(i) Whatever may be the necessities of the period immediately following the war, our aim must be the unification of Europe as a cooperative commonwealth, first in common effort for the satisfaction of general need and secondly in such political institutions as express the common purpose and facilitate its development.

(j) We endorse the ten points put forward as Foundations of Peace by the two Anglican Archbishops, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and the Moderator of the Evangelical Free Church Council; we urge all Christian people to study those points and to support only such policies in the spheres concerned as tend to give effect to them. . . .

Information Service, Federal Council of the Churches, New York.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Most Rev. William Temple, International Broadcast from England to Washington Cathedral at a Special Service of Intercession for the Cause of the United Nations, June 21, 1942

The picture of the coming order begins to take clearer shape. Its details cannot be known until the war is over and the materials available for reconstruction can be estimated. That the recent agreements made between Russia on the one side and the United States and Great Britain on the other, evidently marked an important stage in the process of bringing the foundation of the peace which by our victory we must this time make secure.

The four great nations, Russia, China, United States and Britain will have enormous power and corresponding responsibility. It is the hope of many of us that a revived France will take her share in the completion of victory and in the ordering of the new world and those nations which have suffered so bitterly from the oppression of Nazi Germany will be most justly entitled to exert their influence on the shape of things to be.

I am not now concerned with the policies of the problems to be solved. I am concerned with the function of the church in our two countries over against the prospect opening up before us, for there are great responsibilities to be taken and some grave temptations to be resisted.

. . . freedom cannot be defended in one region and neglected in another. If we were to use our victory to impose our own domination we should be descending to the level of our enemy and deprive our call of its chief moral justification. . . . We fight to preserve our own freedom but also to win, or to win back, the freedom for others.

The first task of the church, then, is to keep the nations true to their own traditions and their own call. The temptation in war-time to forget the claims of liberty are very great. There is a duty to exercise all necessary vigilance. We may rightly renounce for a time some of our own liberties that they may be preserved for the days to come, but we must be very careful how we regard the liberty of those of alien rights, perhaps even of enemies who are to become our fellow-citizens.

. . . Fear and avarice are the most demoralizing of our passions. When the war is over and the victory is won, our two countries will wield almost unlimited economic power. The temptation to use this selfishly will be very strong. Freedom of competition always favors the economically powerful and we shall be tempted to invoke the great name of freedom, under which we fight, in the interest of our own commercial predominance.

Let us prepare beforehand for such temptations and be ready to meet them. The cause to which our nations are dedicated is one on which we can wholeheartedly invoke God's blessing in the name of Christ. For freedom is Our Lord's first principle. . . . As His disciples, we are pledged to freedom as a principle, and our first task is to uphold our people in the serving of their cause and to keep them true to it.

Let me speak of two ways in which we may do this. The first is that which I have already illustrated. We must try to see what are the special temptations which our situation will inevitably bring with it so as to prepare men's minds against them. This is at all times part of the prophetic function of the church and never was it more urgently needed than now. The very fact that our cause is right tends to put us off our guard

and to lull our consciences to sleep. The church must be active, to keep those consciences constantly awake, alert and sensitive.

The second way of fulfilling our functions in this day of crisis concerns our relations with our fellow-Christians throughout the world. The chief influence which we can bring to bear for the healing of the world's wounds will spring from the reality of our Christian fellowship, and here we must be very zealous and very humble. We have to remember that one of the greatest schools of spiritual insight is suffering. If we escape the experience of invasion, with all the persecution that it will certainly bring, we must not only do our utmost to strengthen the bonds of Christian fellowship but we must be ready to sit at the feet of our brothers and sisters who have passed through the fiery furnace of pain by the companionship of the Son of God.

The heroic Church of Norway, the brave Reformed Church of the Netherlands, the steadfast Protestant Federation of France — these and many others who have been our colleagues, but these especially, with the Confessional Church in Germany itself — will have a fund of spiritual treasure when the war is over on which we must be there to draw and to which we can expect to contribute comparatively little.

The leaders of the Roman Catholic Church in many lands, and especially in Germany, have shown a similar constancy, and we must rejoice in every opportunity to cooperate with them also and to learn from them.

To an extent greater than we could have hoped for contacts with our fellow-Christians have been maintained in spite of the obstacles created by war. Let us cherish these and set a high value on them, for there could be, when the war is over, such an efflorescence of all that before the war was germinal in the life of the world-wide Christian fellowship as would do much to overcome the ill-will, the jealousy and the anxiety which must exist when the fighting stops and the long story of atrocities, such as have occurred in Czechoslovakia and in Poland, is brought to an end, and if the church is to play its full part then it must make spiritual preparations now.

That preparation has two main parts: the perception of opportunities and dangers and the deepening of loyalty to the one Lord. In devotion to Him, in dependence on Him, in fellowship with Him, we are all united now and shall find the strength and wisdom for unitedness when the day of opportunity is dawning.

N.Y.T., June 22, 1942 (as recorded by the Columbia Broadcasting System).

APPENDIX II. POLITICAL PARTIES

1. THE UNITED STATES

Wendell L. Willkie, Republican Presidential Candidate, 1940: Speech Delivered at Rochester University, April 23, 1942

It has often been said that the world needs the United States — and that is the truth. But equally the United States, if it is to preserve freedom, needs the world.

Recently, on the Peninsula of Bataan, the people of the United States suffered the worst technical defeat, numerically speaking, that they have ever suffered at the hands of a foreign power. We cannot now repay the men who gave their lives in that great action. Yet to those who survive them it is surely a deep consolation to reflect that out of that defeat a new hope was born.

On Bataan the Filipinos and Americans, fighting side by side, learned the real meaning of equality. We know now, in a way that we could never have known before, the real equality between races. We know, too, that in that idea of equality lies the hope, and the only sure hope, of the future. The day is gone when men and women, of whatever color or creed, can consider themselves the superiors of other creeds or colors. The day of vast empire is past. The day of equal peoples is at hand.

Let us keep that aim shining before us like a light — a light for the people of Europe, for the people of Africa, for the people of Asia, for the people of South America and for the people of our own beloved land.

Vital Speeches, 1942, VIII, p. 459.

Thomas E. Dewey, Candidate for Republican Nomination for President, 1940: Broadcast Delivered at a Luncheon by the Republican Women of Greater New York, May 9, 1942

... We shall win the war and then we must win the peace. For as the most powerful of nations, we have learned that power begets responsibility. Never again shall we forswear hard-won victory. . .

While there does not live the man wise enough to draw a blueprint for the future, there are some things of which we may be certain. As the shape of the world to come emerges we must and shall meet it with

understanding. We must be prepared to formulate and participate in sound solutions for the future. The striking power and the cruising range of the modern airplane confronts us with the necessity for the organization of a peaceful world, free from the continuous danger of sudden attack. Of our responsibility and our power in the family of nations there is no question. Enlightened national interest requires that out of this war we help create a stabilized world. As other nations prosper, we prosper; as other nations become diseased, the infectious germs attack us too. We know we can work together with other nations for war. We must work together with other nations for peace.

We know that when the freedom of one nation is destroyed, the freedom of other nations is already in peril. . . .

We must be vitally alive to the changes enforced by this war upon economic life. Science and invention are leaping ahead to meet the problems of war. Out of their discoveries, industries hitherto unknown will rise to greatness. We stand on the threshold of a new era, and the future is quick with hope.

When this war passes we shall never again tolerate a pinched standard of living or a lowered horizon of production. We shall never again tolerate scarcity or the politics and economics of scarcity. Our burdens of debt and taxation must be lightened by pushing ever upward the levels of national production. The national income must be more equally divided. Business will have no monopoly of power, but it will have the assurance of stable policies in law and government. Agriculture, vitally necessary to an impoverished world and new industrial outlets, must not subsist upon reduced production, but thrive upon increased consumption. The hard-won rights of labor will be taken for granted and fortified in a growing, free economy.

Vital Speeches, 1942, VIII, p. 490-2.

Wendell L. Willkie, Republican Presidential Candidate, 1940: Commencement Speech before Union College, Schenectady, New York, May 11, 1942

. . . I am satisfied that the American people never deliberately and intentionally turned their backs on a program for international cooperation in an organization for maintaining world peace. Possibly they would have preferred changes in the precise Versailles covenant, but not complete aloofness from the efforts of other nations. They were betrayed by leaders without convictions who were thinking in terms of group vote catching.

I do not want to see that same thing happen again. If our isolation after the last war was a contributing factor to the present war and to the economic instability of the past twenty years — and it seems plain that it was — a withdrawal from the problems and responsibilities of the world after this war would be sheer disaster. Even our relative geographical isolation no longer exists.

... For America must choose one of three courses after this war: Narrow isolationism, which inevitably means the loss of our own liberty; international imperialism, which means the sacrifice of some other nation's liberty; or the creation of a world in which there shall be an equality of opportunity for every race and every nation.

Vital Speeches, 1942, VIII, p. 486.

Resolution Adopted by Republican National Committee, Chicago, April 20, 1942

.

1. We demand the prosecution of an offensive war, relentlessly and without reservation, whatever it may cost in wealth, energy or human life, until the United States and its allies have won a complete victory over their enemies.

2. We will recognize no peace with those enemies except peace with victory and we will never entertain any proposals of peace until such victory be won. There shall be no appeasement or compromise.

3. We realize that after this war the responsibility of the nation will not be circumscribed within the territorial limits of the United States; that our nation has an obligation to assist in the bringing about of understanding, comity and cooperation among the nations of the world in order that our own liberty may be preserved and that the blighting and destructive processes of war may not again be forced upon us and upon the free and peace-loving peoples of the earth.

.

Received from the Republican National Committee, Washington.

Herbert Hoover, Ex-President: Address to the National Industrial Conference Board, New York, May 21, 1942

.

First. To win the war we need develop the most effective organization of it. Before the last war ended there came out of the swamps of the war

organization of all principal nations the same formation — the establishment of a National War Council. Every nation came to it.

In this present war the British, the Germans, the Russians, the Italians, and I expect the Japanese, have such Councils. I believe the time has come when America should have a more definite War Council embracing in its members the civilian heads of the great war agencies.

Second. In the last war we made little advance preparation to cross the precipitous mountains of after-war disorganization or of methods to recover the lost freedoms.

We know more about it this time. We need to think out economic reconstruction. We must think out the recovery of freedom. And that preparedness can come only from organized objective research and public debate. It must come from many sources and many places and not from the government alone. It is a safe area for vigorous speech.

Third. The last time we did not prepare for peace-making.

We were told: "Destroy the Kaiser first. Discuss peace afterwards." Today, again, it is "Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo must be first destroyed; we cannot discuss peace until that is done."

We went to the Peace Conference in 1919 animated by the loftiest ideals, but we were totally unprepared for the specific problems and the ambushes that had to be met at the peace table. We did not secure much peace.

There must be just as much preparedness for peace-making as there is for war. And in many ways it is a more difficult job.

Preparedness for peace deals largely with intangibles, the setting up of moral, intellectual, economic and political forces over the whole world which will produce and hold peace.

Nor is this alone the job of the several government departments now engaged upon it. If we are to make a better job of the peace this time than last it will be because intelligent public discussion develops more ideas and better ideas and because a public understanding the problems is prepared to accept the solutions made.

Fourth. Unless we are to see again the aftermath of the Thirty Years' War, when one-third of the people of Europe fell before the horsemen of famine and pestilence we must have preparedness, not alone in America, but in every surplus-food-producing country. And unless there be food there will be no foundation for peace . . .

Wendell L. Willkie, Republican Presidential Candidate, 1940: Three Point Program on War Aims, New York, August 4, 1942

.

1. That America must fight this war in union with other countries until the last vestige of totalitarianism and aggression is destroyed throughout the world. For we have come to know that the world of today is so interrelated that a cancerous growth in one part quickly infects all other parts. And we now know that we in America, for the sake of our own survival, must be concerned with the health of every part of the world.

2. That no matter how painful or how long and arduous the road to complete victory may be, we must tread it with no thought of appeasement, no hope of peace until we reach its end. And that end must be a world in which men and women of every race and creed can live decent lives of expanding economic opportunity and political and religious freedom.

3. That when the war is over, we must set up institutions and methods of international political and economic cooperation and adjustment among the nations of the earth to the end that excess nationalistic ideas and military ambitions will find no fertile spawning ground; that we must, in addition, devise some system of joint international force to prevent their growth under any circumstances. For we are resolved that the people of the world shall not again be cursed with the frightful suffering of modern warfare.

.

Christian Science Monitor, August 4, 1942.

Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Minority Leader of the House of Representatives: Address before the Nebraska State Republican Convention, Omaha, September 3, 1942

.

While we are fighting this war we must be thinking about what we will do with the peace. Peace will come some day. It must be our kind of peace. We must be ready for it and not be caught unprepared. We must be thinking how we can cooperate with the other peoples of the world for an enduring peace of law and order. We must be considering a return, after the war, of the control of the Government to the people. We must be deliberating on how we can solve — as other nations must deliberate on how they can solve — internal problems. Those problems

will arise in aggravated form the moment the war ceases. We must not only win the war *We must win the peace.*

I need not tell you America is the hope of the world today. A free America, a strong America, an America with Constitutional government unshaken, is the only kind of an America which can be a beacon of hope and progress for all the other peoples of the world in the years to come. If America should go down, the doom of civilization would be swift and sure. If America should go down, everything for which America stands, and for which other peoples of the world hope and pray would be extinguished under the brutal, despotic rule of men mad with lust for power. We must, and we will, keep the torch of liberty aflame in our own nation. We will keep it burning to light the way of all the other peoples in the world to the freedom, the rights, the privileges and the progress which we in America have achieved, and which we cherish more than human existence itself.

It will not be possible for us to carry freedom anywhere else in the world if we lose it at home. We cannot force liberty upon other peoples, we can only share it. Freedom is not something which is achieved by statutes. It is accomplished through spiritual enlightenment. It is not something which is legislated or decreed to men. It is something which has to be lived to be known. And it must be deserved to be achieved and retained.

.

Release from the Republican National Committee, Washington.

Wendell L. Willkie, Republican Presidential Candidate, 1940: Report to the People (Broadcast) after Return from Middle East, Russia and China, New York, October 26, 1942

. . . To win that peace three things seem to me necessary — first, we must plan now for peace on a global basis; second, the world must be free, economically and politically, for nations and for men that peace may exist in it; third, America must play an active, constructive part in freeing it and keeping its peace.

When I say that peace must be planned on a global basis, I mean quite literally that it must embrace the earth. Continents and oceans are plainly only part of a whole, seen, as I have just seen them, from the air. Russia and China, Egypt, Syria and Turkey, Iraq and Iran are also parts. And it is inescapable that there can be no peace for any

part of the world unless the foundations of peace are made secure throughout all parts of the world.

When I say that in order to have peace this world must be free, I am only reporting that a great process has started which no man — certainly not Hitler — can stop. Men and women all over the world are on the march, physically, intellectually and spiritually. After centuries of ignorant and dull compliance hundreds of millions of people in Eastern Europe and Asia have opened the books. Old fears no longer frighten them. They are no longer willing to be Eastern slaves for Western profits. They are beginning to know that men's welfare throughout the world is interdependent. They are resolved, as we must be, that there is no more place for imperialism within their own society than in the society of nations. The big house on the hill surrounded by mud huts has lost its awesome charm.

Our Western world and our presumed supremacy are now on trial. Our boasting and our big talk leave Asia cold. Men and women in Russia and China and in the Middle East are conscious now of their own potential strength. They are coming to know that many of the decisions about the future of the world lie in their hands. And they intend that these decisions shall leave the peoples of each nation free from foreign domination, free for economic, social and spiritual growth.

Finally, when I say that this world demands the full participation of a self-confident America, I am only passing on an invitation which these peoples of the East have given us. They would like the United States to be one of their partners in this grand adventure. They want us to join them in creating a new society, global in scope, free alike of the economic injustices of the West and the political malpractices of the East. But as a partner in that great new combination they want us neither hesitant, incompetent nor afraid. They want a partner who will not hesitate to speak out for the correction of injustice anywhere in the world.

Our allies in the East know that we intend to pour out our resources in this war. But they expect us now — not after the war — to use the enormous power of our giving to promote liberty and justice. Other peoples, not yet fighting, are waiting no less eagerly for us to accept the most challenging opportunity of all history — the chance to help create a new society in which men and women the globe around can live and grow invigorated by freedom.

Wendell L. Willkie's Report to the People, New York, 1942;
Vital Speeches, 1942, IX, p. 34-9 (see also *One World*, New
York, Simon and Schuster, 1943).

Wendell L. Willkie, Republican Presidential Candidate, 1940: Address before the New York Herald Tribune Forum, New York, November 16, 1942

The importance of the military in today's struggle is clear to us all. My concern tonight is with an even more powerful weapon than the gun, and that is the idea.

For, however important the role of bayonets and guns may have been in the development of mankind, the role of ideas has been vastly more important — and, in the long run, more conclusive. In historical times, at any rate, men have not often fought merely for the joy of killing each other. They have fought for a purpose. Sometimes that purpose has not been very inspiring. Sometimes it has been quite selfish. But a war won without a purpose is a war won without a victory.

A most outstanding example of a war fought with a purpose was our own American Revolution. We did not fight the Revolution because we hated Englishmen and wanted to kill them, but because we loved freedom and wanted to establish it. I think it is fair to say, in the light of what that freedom has meant to the world, that the victory won at Yorktown was the greatest victory ever won by the force of arms. But this was not because our army was large and formidable. It was because our purpose was so clear, so lofty and so well defined.

Unhappily this cannot be said of the First World War. It has become almost a historical truism that that war was a war without victory. Of course, it is true that, while we were engaged in it, we thought, or said, that we were fighting for a high purpose. Woodrow Wilson, our commander-in-chief, stated our purpose in eloquent terms. We were fighting to make the world safe for democracy — to make it safe, not just with a slogan but by accepting a set of principles known as the Fourteen Points, and by setting up a full-fledged international structure to be known as the League of Nations. That was a high purpose, surely. But when the time came to execute it in a peace treaty, a fatal flaw was discovered. We found that we and our allies were not really agreed upon that purpose. On the one hand, some of our allies had entangled themselves in secret treaties; and they were more intent upon carrying out those treaties and upon pursuing traditional power diplomacy, than upon opening the new vista that Mr. Wilson had sought to define. And, on the other hand, we ourselves were not as deeply dedicated to our declared purposes as we had led the world to believe. The net result was the abandonment of most of the purposes for which the war had supposedly been fought. Because those purposes were abandoned, that

war was denounced by our generation as an enormous and futile slaughter. Millions had lost their lives. But no new idea, no new goal rose from the ashes of their sacrifice.

Now I think that these considerations lead us inescapably to one conclusion. I think we must conclude that, generally speaking, nothing of importance can be won in peace which has not already been won in the war itself. I say "nothing of importance." It is quite true, of course, that many details must be worked out at the peace table and at conferences succeeding the peace table — details which cannot be judiciously worked out under the pressure of war. We — we and our allies, of course — cannot, for instance, stop fighting the Japs to make a detailed plan of what we intend to do about Burma when victory is won. Nor can we relent in our pressure against Hitler to decide the detailed future of Poland now.

What we must win now, during the war, are the principles. We must know what our line of solution will be. . . .

.

. . . We must know that we shall win in the future peace only what we are now winning in the war — no more, no less

. . . we are faced today with two problems: How shall we determine what we want in the next peace? And how shall we prepare ourselves to win it during the war?

First, to determine our aims it is clearly necessary to reach substantial agreement with our allies. Here, as in our Revolution, agreement in detail is not necessary, or even desirable. But unless we are to repeat the unhappy history of the First World War, agreement in principle must be won. Moreover, it must exist, not just among the leaders of the allies. The basic agreement I am thinking of must be established among the allied peoples themselves. We must make sure that these peoples are fighting for essentially the same thing.

Now what does this mean? It means that every one of us has the obligation to speak out, to exchange ideas, freely and frankly, across the Pacific, across the Atlantic, and here at home. Unless the British people know the way we are thinking in America, and take it to heart, and unless we have a similar idea of what they are thinking in England and in the Commonwealth, there can be no hope of agreement. We must know what the people of Russia and China aim for, and we must let them know our aims.

.

Thus, in order that we may win a real victory, we must encourage the utmost amount of discussion among ourselves and with our allies. Moreover, we must be very clear as to what this word "allies" means. We have many allies — roughly, I should estimate them at a billion people. Britain and the United States are great powers, but they are not the only powers involved in this struggle, nor even necessarily the greatest powers. Russia and China have each already suffered greater losses in this war than all the rest of us put together. Those two enormous nations are also our allies, and consequently, when we talk about reaching agreement among allied peoples, we must mean the Russian and the Chinese people as well as the British people and the American people.

Indeed, we must go further. We must try to find out, and openly to express, the desires and hopes of hundreds of millions of other peoples — in the torn heart of Europe, in India, on the embattled shores of the Mediterranean, in Africa, on the southern shores of Asia and in our own hemisphere. For if some of these people are not now our allies they are potential allies, and they are necessary participants in the world that is to follow this war. We must win substantial agreement with them also. If we do not we cannot win substantial peace.

That then is our first problem — to discuss, and to discuss openly and frankly, the desires and the needs of the allied peoples so that we may all come into substantial agreement concerning what we are fighting for.

.

But discussion alone is not enough. Having discussed what we want to win the peace, having set our goals, our second problem faces us: How, during the war, shall we prepare ourselves to attain those goals in the peace? The answer to that is plain: We must learn to work together; we must learn to work with all our allies that we may win both the war and the peace. We must work together today; tomorrow will be too late. Our most immediate common need is, of course, a united military plan arrived at by a board of strategy representative not alone of the United States and Great Britain but representing likewise our other allies. Even such obviously essential cooperation has not yet been brought about. It is true that we are beginning to work with the British. That is comparatively easy, for we are possessed of the same linguistic and cultural heritage. But we must learn equally well to work with Russians and Chinese in the arduous task of today. And that task is not merely the task of military cooperation, however pressing that may be; it is also the task of working together now for a world at peace. For as I

have already said, military victory is fruitless unless on the anvil of war we hammer out joint and honorable purposes

And now about the goals for which we work. Here again perhaps we may learn from past failures.

.

. . . we should work today to make available presently to all the United Nations and, when the war is over, to all the world, access to the materials indispensable to economic self-development . . . Its accomplishment primarily depends upon acceptance by the peoples of the world. For if the failure to reach international understanding after the last war taught us anything, it taught us this: Even if war leaders apparently agree upon principles, when they come to the peace time they make their own interpretations of their previous declarations. So unless today, while the war is being fought, the people of the United States and of Great Britain, of Russia and of China and of all the other United Nations fundamentally agree upon their purposes, fine and idealistic expressions of hope such as those of the Atlantic Charter will live merely to mock us as have Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points. The Four Freedoms will not be accomplished by the declarations of those momentarily in power. They will become real only if the people of the world forge them into actuality. And political internationalism alone will not accomplish them. Real freedom must rest on economic internationalism.

Now, let's take a specific and difficult example of what lies before us if we are to give reality to those freedoms we have proclaimed. The Malayan Peninsula and the islands of the Southwest Pacific are areas containing, among other things, the principal source of the rubber supply of the world. They are inhabited in part, at least, by unlettered and in some instances, perhaps, savage people. Those who sneer when it is suggested that freedom and self-government can be brought to all men feel that such areas must be ruled perpetually by some nation's colonial imperialism. Now assume that the Allies reconquer those areas — shall we return them to their previous status, where their defense was courageous but inadequate and their peoples undeveloped under the governmental custody of some one nation? Or shall they be wards of the United Nations, their basic commodities made freely available to the world, their safety protected by an international police force; the full yield of their resources used for their own health, their own education and development and for their training — no matter how long it takes — in the practices of self-government? It is the principles upon which

we shall base the solution of such problems that we must begin now to determine for ourselves.

There is another economic condition about which we must be thinking, for it is the most necessary of all the goals to the accomplishment of real freedom. Not only must people have access to what other peoples produce but their own products in turn must reach men all over the world. There will be no peace, there will be no real development, there will be no economic stability unless we find the method by which the trade barriers hampering the flow of goods are removed. Now I know there are many men, particularly in America, where our standard of living exceeds the standard of living in the rest of the world, who shudder at such a prospect, who believe that any such process will only lessen our own standard of living. The reverse of this is true.

.

We, the people, must begin to solve these problems today, not tomorrow. For we know that bayonets and guns are feeble as compared with the power of the idea.

Our Fight for Survival in a Free World, Report of the New York Herald Tribune Eleventh Forum on Current Problems, New York, 1942, p. 123-9.

Wendell L. Willkie, Republican Presidential Candidate, 1940: Address at a Rally of the Canadian-Aid-to-Russia Fund, Toronto, November 25, 1942

. . . this war is either a "grand coalition" of peoples, fighting a common war for liberation, or it is nothing. It must be either a great pooling of all our energies, inspired by a united strategy, planned and fought on a global scale, or it will be lost. Finally, as we are doing here tonight, we must talk about this war as united peoples; we must discuss its issues; we must declare the common purpose which drives us all; or we run the risk of having worked and sacrificed and suffered to win a war for no purpose. . . .

.

. . . we shall have to make articulate and real our common purposes.

. . . the people must define their purposes during the war. I am quite deliberately trying to provoke discussion of those purposes between the peoples of the various countries of the world. For I live in a constant dread that this war may end before the people of the world have come

to a common understanding of what they fight for and what they hope for after the war is over. . .

. . . Unless Britons and Canadians and Russians and Chinese and Americans and all our fighting Allies, in the common cooperation of war, find the instrumentalities and the methods of cooperative effort after the war, we, the people, have failed our time and our generation.

Our leaders, jointly and singly, have expressed some of our common aspiration. One of the finest expressions came only the other day from Chiang Kai-shek in a message to the Western world, delivered through the Herald Tribune Forum in New York City. He concluded:¹

"China has no desire to replace Western imperialism in Asia with an oriental imperialism or isolationism of its own or of any one else. We hold that we must advance from the narrow idea of exclusive alliances and regional blocs, which in the end make for bigger and better wars, to effective organization of world unity. Unless real world cooperation replaces both isolationism and imperialism of whatever form in the new interdependent world of free nations, there will be no lasting security for you or for us."

Let me read you another statement of purpose singularly explicit and exact:²

"Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations and integrity of their territories, liberation of enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes, economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance to them in attaining their material welfare, restoration of democratic liberties, the destruction of the Hitlerite regime" . . .

. . . This, Mr. Stalin calls a "program of action." A program for Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations, for the United States and for Russia. . . .

. . . I, for my part, find one objection: Mr. Stahn limits his program of action to the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. It should be applied to the world. . . .

. . . it remains for us to convince those people to whom we are promising freedom and opportunity, that we really believe what we declared to be self-evident truth in our declaration of independence: that all men are created equal. If we are to convince others of our good faith, we must see to it that racial and cultural and economic exclusiveness belong to the past, within, as well as without, our borders.

¹ *Our Fight for Survival in a Free World*, Report of New York Herald Tribune Eleventh Forum on Current Problems, New York, 1942, p 247.

² See Joseph Stahn's speech of November 6, 1942, p 371.

Our leaders have tried to state our purposes. Those purposes will not be accomplished merely by statements from leaders. It is the people who must bring them about — not after the war, but while we fight.

The people of the world must win this war. The people of the world must win the peace.

. . . we do not need to fear Russia. We need to learn to work with her against our common enemy, Hitler. We need to learn to work with her in the world after the war. For Russia is a dynamic country, a vital new society, a force that cannot be by-passed in any future world. . . .

. . . The Russian people are turning to the democracies of the west for hope and aid. We must not fail them. . . .

. . . the Russian people behind those fronts, who are our allies today, must be our friends tomorrow.

It is with them that we must work to make this war what their leader has called it: "A great war of liberation"

N.Y.T., November 26, 1942.

Resolution Adopted by the Republican National Committee, St. Louis, December 7, 1942

WHEREAS, today, December seventh, is the anniversary of the dastardly attack by Japan upon our outpost, Pearl Harbor.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Republican National Committee solemnly pledges to those who died that day that they shall not have died in vain. We assert the unity of the American people in their determination to fight to victory. We pledge to the service of our beloved country, our hearts, our bodies and our possessions.

We take this occasion to reaffirm the Resolution passed by it at its meeting on April 20th last, and to concur in the declaration subsequently issued by Republican Members of Congress.

This Committee dedicates itself to victory over our foreign enemies, to a just peace when war shall end, and to the preservation of the Republic under our Constitution.

God Bless America!

Received from the Republican National Committee, Washington.

Harold E. Stassen, Governor of the State of Minnesota: Address before the Economic Club, Detroit, December 14, 1942

. . . I speak to you frankly of what I consider to be the threefold challenge of the days ahead.

First and foremost, to do everything possible to back up the men in

the Armed Forces until complete victory comes to the Stars and Stripes and the Flags of the United Nations.

Second, to plan and prepare now to meet the post-war problems of the home front on the fundamental basis of our American way of life — social, economic and political.

Third, to think through now our responsibility to take a leading part in future relations between the peoples of the world, and to devise the means and methods of United Nations' action in the years ahead.

.

Our post-war environment must be one in which our great American industrial and economic system, with its mass production methods, has an opportunity to reach reasonably full effectiveness. This will require some significant readjustments in our thinking. We have tended to think too much in terms of extreme alternatives. We have discussed our total problems on the basis that private enterprise must completely answer them, or, in the alternative, that government must take over and answer them. We might well find that the best answer will be a joint answer. A government that concerns itself with the humanitarian approach toward those of its citizens who are from time to time caught in the variations of a free economic system, need not and should not be unfriendly and antagonistic to private industry and individual enterprise.

I feel very strongly that the science of government has not advanced with the rapidity and ingenuity that the other sciences have progressed. Think of the developments in mass production, in travel, and in communication. Have the mechanics of government kept pace?

It should be possible for men who have shown such extreme ingenuity and productivity to work out the means by which government fits in with a free economy, under modern conditions, rather than clashes with that free economy.

This specifically requires that the approach of government to its problems should not destroy incentive and initiative.

The approach to the profits question, for example, ought not to be primarily the matter of the amount of profit, but rather the method by which those profits are secured. Do they arise from a monopolistic stifling of competition and the exacting of a heavy premium for a static dead level of production? Or do they arise from finding a better way to place in more hands a larger quantity of higher quality production? In other words, let the test be "What is the effect upon the standard of living of the people as a whole?"

This approach would also require that the extreme restrictions of the Security Exchange Law be greatly modified so as to recognize the need of venture capital. If government takes all element of chance out of investment, it will at the same time cut all possibility of real progress.

.

Government must also devise special steps by which new industry and new business and the results of invention and research can be initiated without bearing the heavy burdens of taxation and regulation which established industry must and can bear.

The birth rate of new enterprises is just as important to the future of our country as the birth rate of the population.

Government must recognize that mere bigness is not in and of itself a bad thing in America, so long as that bigness has worthy competition in one form or another; and that may be indirectly through competing products in the same general field of demand, or in a direct competition as you men know in the automobile industry.

It will be important, however, that power in any hands carry with it commensurate responsibility. This principle will need to be fairly applied to organizations of labor as well as of business. The development of the rights of the individual workman in his union, probably paralleling in some way the development of the rights of the minority stockholder in his corporation, and the development of the social responsibilities and accountability of labor organizations must keep pace with their power and authority. This problem will be one of the vital parts of the whole post-war period.

May I re-emphasize that the first concern of government in the post-war world should be to create a favorable environment in which free enterprise, by its inventiveness, its management, its mass production, and its distribution, can make the greatest possible contribution to the standard of living of the people.

.

But my emphasis upon this first phase of government's approach does not mean that that can be the only principle for government to follow. Government must also fill those gaps between what private industry does accomplish and the total needs of the people. This means the carrying on of extensive programs of public improvement during periods of low industrial employment, and the establishment of a floor of security below which the members of the community would not be permitted to fall. Worthwhile improvements, conducted on the basis of the fruitful

use of manpower, such as the highway systems of the future, the networks of airports and airways, the rebuilding of congested cities, will give limitless opportunities for this type of governmental activity.

The methods of conducting these programs and the methods of financing them must be so worked out that they do not violently clash with that portion of the total job that is being done by the workings of a free economy. This will require a considerable revision of our tax policies in this country. It will require mutual confidence and respect between government management and industrial management. It will require a frank and forthright facing of problems, with the best matching, in staff conferences, of theory and of practice. It will require that agriculture and labor be counted in as major elements in our economy and in our government.

.

. . . I urge that we plan now on taking a leading part in the future relations between the peoples of the world

The walls of isolation are gone forever. In their place we must build bridges of understanding and of definite relationships to the other nations of the world.

I believe this might best develop out of our present associations in the war.

I suggest specifically that we move toward the establishment of a definite continuing organization of the United Nations of the World.

.

On this basis, the citizens in this room, the citizens of this state in the years ahead would be not only citizens of Michigan, not only citizens of the United States of America, but also citizens of the United Nations of the World.

That means, of course, new privileges and opportunities that you have not had before. It also means new duties and responsibilities that you have not had before. This United Nations government could be worked out in definite form of mechanics, with the legislative, the executive and the judicial phases. We have not time today to go into that part of it, but I would like to suggest seven specific fields in which this government might then act:

1. Establish temporary governments over each of the Axis nations, preferably utilizing able citizens of the United Nations whose ancestry goes back to the Axis nation involved. Under these temporary governments, the Axis nations should be entirely disarmed, their criminal

leadership punished, but no inhuman post-war vengeance against entire populations should be countenanced.

2. Establish an airways commission to have administrative control of the great international airports and airways of the future. We all recognize the almost limitless future of the air. We will need world-wide administration of air fields, of radio beams, of weather reports, of airway traffic codes.

3. Establish an administrative body to take control of the gateways to the seven seas.

4. Establish a commission whose prime task would be to increase the literacy of peoples of the world, not on a fanciful Utopian basis, but on the realistic foundation that the ability to read and write is the means of much of the progress of man.

5. Establish a code of justice for the relations between the peoples of the nations of the world and a machinery for the administration of that code of justice, including a United Nations Court.

6. Set up a trade commission to gradually work out increased world trade, carefully seeking to prevent either stifling obstructions or heavy dumping of goods, both of which break down economic systems and cause world distress. The food and supplies administration under Governor Herbert Lehman could well be the forerunner of this activity.

7. Develop a United Nations Legion to be the world police force to enforce the administration of world justice and to make effective the supervision of airways and seaways. This force would be comprised primarily of modern air strength, naval units and mobile mechanized troops. They would be backed up by maintaining armed strength by the individual United Nations, including our own country.

The seat of administration of many of these functions might well be some point like Panama, readily accessible by sea and air to all continents, world-wide in its very atmosphere, and yet readily defended from attack.

Some question may be raised as to the justice of having a United National Government administer so many of these activities on a world-wide basis, including thereby administration of these matters over nations that are not members of the United Nations group.

It seems to me that this will be basically no different from the fact that we have in our midst many individual men and women who are not citizens of our country. Hence they have no voice in the decisions as to our government or our laws or our courts. Yet they are under the jurisdiction of our government, our laws and our courts. They have certain rights, duties, responsibilities. In fact, we even take away many

of the rights of citizenship for the serious violation of our criminal laws.

Why then should there not be nations who in the world sphere must abide by the decisions, rules, justice of a United Nations of the world, even though they are not members?

Furthermore, the course should always be as clearly defined as possible, through which non-member nations may ultimately become members of the United Nations group.

To those who scoff that efforts to establish a governmental organization of such nature and purpose are idealistic and impossible, might we point out that the alternative is recurring wars of increasing tragedy and horror.

We now have a world-wide vision to win the war. We must keep our sights high and maintain a world-wide vision to win an enduring peoples' peace.

Copy received from Governor Stassen.

Herbert Hoover, Ex-President: Address before the Executives' Club and Other Clubs, Chicago, December 16, 1942

The essence of my proposal is that we have no armistice, no general peace conference, such as Versailles. But that we set the peace-making in two stages. The first to be an instant "conditional peace" that will turn the world toward political, economic and spiritual recovery without the delays of last time. And then that the world should take time to cool off and work out one by one and separately the solutions for lasting peace.

To do this the United Nations would need to agree in advance to the terms of a conditional peace and subsequent program. They will need to impose the conditional peace and enforce it. Enforcement will not be difficult, for immediately at the victory the enemy will obviously be required to surrender his arms. The Allies will possess the only remaining military force. Even a small air force could impose the conditional peace and the subsequent program.

The declaration of conditional peace should embrace the minimum of:

1. Total disarmament of the enemy.
2. The designation of provisional boundaries of nations.
3. Machinery for the repatriation of prisoners and civilians driven from their homes.
4. The removal of the economic blockade the instant the enemy has handed over his arms.

5. The immediate organization to relieve famine, combat pestilence and aid in reconstruction. Otherwise there will be anarchy and no peace.

6. The provisional restoration of all commercial treaties that trade may begin again.

7. Immediate call of freely chosen elective constitutional assemblies or parliamentary leaders in the liberated and enemy countries.

8. Immediate reduction of armaments of the United Nations themselves to the minimum force needed to maintain international order and enforce peace provisions.

With these minimums the world could move forward.

There will be a host of gigantic problems to be solved afterwards. There must be machinery for the preservation of peace. There are the problems of world disarmament and of long-view international economic relations. There are the problems of the disposition of enemy countries, of the government of backward nations, solutions of Europe's irredentas and federations of weaker states. There will be questions of reparations, intergovernmental debts, punishment of criminal actions, and many other measures. And they must be so solved that the dynamic forces in the world which always make for war are extinguished and the forces of peace given strength.

Many of the problems must have time for deliberation. Others must have time for the cooling of war revenge and hatred. Many of them must have time for the development of world opinion and adherence. They should be separated from each other for solution and each saved on its merits.

.

Therefore the plan proposed is to appoint these Commissions as part of the conditional peace. After each of the problems has been separately examined, reported or negotiated, then the principal governments should act.

Some say this is requiring nations to sign upon the dotted line, that it is an "imposed peace" and is not "negotiation." As a matter of fact the peace terms were imposed upon the enemy last time and much of them was indirectly imposed on the liberated nations. But they were imposed only after the world had been infinitely demoralized and its wounds lacerated. Indeed this plan provides a chance for much more adequate examination of the views and rights of all nations than at Versailles.

And the conclusions of these commissions can be open to expression of public opinion. There can be time for debate.

Even if somebody possessed an absolute and perfect formula for these gigantic problems of disarmament, economic relations and preserving peace, no such settlements could endure unless accepted by at least the democratic peoples themselves. If they are badly formulated they will be upset at the ballot box. . . . If this is a people's war, it must be a people's peace

.

It is a favorable and important sign that there is today active debate of the problems of peace throughout the Allied world. . . .

And out of these discussions in America there are certain propositions upon which there seems now to be general acceptance. . . . These acceptances are mainly:

1 The major purpose of this unutterable sacrifice, suffering and death is to win a lasting peace for mankind. We are resolute that this time it must be a peace which assures the freedom of men.

2 Lasting peace cannot be attained unless there be cooperation between nations to maintain it.

3 There must be definite machinery for that purpose.

4 We must have just as effective advance preparedness for peace as for war. Part of the failure to win the peace last time was because we listened to the slogan of "Win the war first and discuss peace afterwards."

5. The foundation of preparedness lies in public discussion. It lies in examination of the causes of failure the last time. It lies in the advancement of new ideas and the hammering of them out on the anvil of debate. Public discussion is not only the basis of preparedness to peace-making, but it is vital if there is to be intelligent public support in the settlements that are made.

That even these propositions are so generally accepted is evidence of progress in preparedness for peace.

.

And I would make an observation upon the general discussion of peace problems now in progress. There are many Americans who believed America could contribute more greatly to lasting peace if she kept out of this war. The die, however, was cast at Pearl Harbor. If we would attain lasting peace now, we must win this war with undoubted victory. And if we win the peace, we must have unity . . .

.

Copy received from Mr. Hoover.

2. GREAT BRITAIN

*Manifesto Issued by the National Executive of the British Labor Party, September 1, 1939*¹

. . . The British Labor Movement has always declared that there are no international disputes incapable of settlement by peaceful negotiation. That is why it has always stood by the League of Nations. That is why it has always supported collective security. The British Labor Movement continues to affirm these principles.

Equally, however, it has always insisted that aggression on the part of any power must be resisted. It has declared that the use of force in international disputes must be made forever impossible. . . .

British Labor has no quarrel with the German people. It does not seek to deprive them of any just rights to be obtained by rational and equal negotiation. It will, now that the die is cast, use all its influence and authority to secure a peace the basis of which is in accord with the faith it holds. It will resist any attempt to use the present conflict for ends that sow the seeds of further war. So long as its principles animate those whom Herr Hitler has driven to resistance against his aggression, so long they can count on the support of British Labor.

None knows better than the Labor movement the tragic folly of war; but a stage has been reached in the development of Europe where war has been chosen by Herr Hitler as a deliberate instrument of national policy. It is impossible for Labor to acquiesce in claims supported, or conquests achieved, by this method. To do so would be an indefensible betrayal of its own vital faith.

The British Labor movement therefore calls upon all its members to stand solidly behind it in resistance to aggression. Until those who have been willing to resort to its use have been overthrown, it sees no prospect of an enduring peace. The movement must summon all its energy and devotion to the task of defeating the aggressor. British Labor has taken this stand with calmness and without passion. It will hold itself free to define in its own way the conditions of a just settlement at a later stage. It will use all its authority to build a peace of justice which removes the causes out of which war comes.

With the defeat of the aggressors there emerges the prospect of building a better world from which the roots of economic and political griev-

¹ See also Arthur Greenwood's broadcast (acting leader of the Labor Party) on September 3, 1939 (*The Outbreak of War*, p. 17-18).

ances have been removed. The British Labor movement will give all its strength to making the foundations of that world a secure defense of peace and justice.

The Outbreak of War, p. 15-16.

***Sir Archibald Sinclair, M.P., Leader of the Liberal Party:*¹ *Broadcast, September 3, 1939*²**

. . . The struggle will be hard and long — the suffering will be intense — but neither our liberties nor our material prosperity can be preserved unless they are shared with all the peoples of the earth. Our first task therefore — a long and arduous task — must be to break the yoke of Nazi tyranny and our next to build a peaceful order in Europe based on fair play and good faith. The greater the effort and the sacrifice that each one of us makes to secure victory, the sooner the carnage and the suffering will end. In the face of this supreme challenge to our civilization, party divisions sink into insignificance, but I know that my fellow Liberals everywhere, as always, will shrink from no sacrifice to preserve our freedom and to assert the rule of law.

What is at stake in this great conflict is your right and mine, and the rights of other plain and ordinary people like us in this and other countries to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Let us in that cause, like the authors of the American Declaration of Independence, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

The Outbreak of War, p. 19-20; see also his speech to the House of Commons, October 12, 1939 (*Parl. Deb. Commons*, vol. 352, 571-3).

Clement R. Attlee, Leader of the Labor Party: Speech to the House of Commons,*³ *October 12, 1939

. . . We of the Labor party have taken up a definite stand against wanton aggression and for the rule of law. We are convinced that there is no prospect of enduring peace until we get rid of violence. . . . We are resolved to carry on this struggle until we have secured the necessary conditions for a peaceful world, and in doing this we are acting in complete harmony with the policy of our party, affirmed and reaffirmed at conference after conference. It is impossible for anyone at the present

¹ Later Secretary of State for Air.

² See also Sir John Simon's speech to the National Liberal Club, London, March 13, 1940 (*British War Aims*, p. 44).

³ Later Lord Privy Seal.

time to discuss usefully the detailed terms of a European settlement, but we can and should affirm principles, and the first principle is that we cannot any longer endure a world that is subject at all times to violence, a world in which there is no rule of law. We can, I think, lay down the principles on which we think an enduring peace can be made. For our part, we laid down those principles long ago, and we see no reason to alter the principles of Labor's peace policy. We must get a new world, we must get a Europe in which the rights of all nations are recognized.

I was glad to hear the Prime Minister say, in his speech, that in arriving at any peace, we should do it in consultation with the German people — we should be considering the future of the German people. We are not standing for a Carthaginian peace, but we are standing for a Europe in which, while the German people will have their rights, all other nations will have their rights as well. There is a great deal of propaganda about Germany having room to live. The Poles must have room to live, the Czechs must have room to live. All the small nations as well as the great nations have their contribution to make, and the size of a nation or of its territory bears no indication of the contribution that it has made to mankind — witness Palestine and Greece. If we are standing for that, we are standing against domination, we are standing against Imperialism, and we must also stand for the only conditions under which it is possible that those smaller nations could exist, and that is a system of collective security in which they do not have to rely only on their own strength. If we want to build up a new Europe, it must be a more closely coordinated Europe.

We stand for disarmament. Herr Hitler talks of disarmament, but you must have disarmament of the mind first of all, and you must have security if you are going to get disarmament. . . . no disarmament is possible except in exchange for really effective measures for collective defense. Those are the principles that we would lay down. We hear talk of colonies. We do not believe in the carving-up of colonies or in the exploitation of colonies by any power. We believe in colonies being for the people who live there, and in the use of all the resources of the world in the interests of all the peoples of the world. We believe that we can build up a new world, but it must be a new world based on principles, and those are the principles of democracy, that regard the rights of others as well as our own rights.

I think that we should let the German people know that this choice is before them. The choice before them is not of being defeated in war and disappearing as effective members of the European comity of

nations. They have the choice of stopping this war, they have the choice of contributing to a great Europe, and they know that this country is standing simply for the conditions of peace. But until we get these, until we get people on whose word we can rely, we must with resolution pursue this struggle, because no patched-up peace which is only going to lead to another war, no patched-up peace which will leave only an uneasy world staggering under a huge burden of armaments, will content us. We are in this struggle. We must see that we come out of this struggle with nothing less than a new world.

Parl. Deb. Commons, vol. 352, 568-71.

Clement R. Attlee, M.P., Leader of the Labor Party: Speech, Caxton Hall, London, November 8, 1939¹

What then should be the principles of a peace settlement?

The first principle is that there should be no dictated peace. We have no desire to humiliate, to crush or to divide the German nation. There must be restitution made to the victims of aggression, but all ideas of revenge and punishment must be excluded. If peace is to be lasting it must result from the agreement of all, not from the dictation of a few nations. The failure of the treaties at the end of the last war to bring abiding peace was largely due to the neglect of this principle. But if we desire to build a new world its foundations must be laid not only by the large and strong, but by the small and less powerful. It is the function of law to prevent the strong abusing his strength at the expense of the weak. The smaller nations, just because they are not aggressive, bring to the councils of the nation a most valuable element.

The second principle necessarily follows. It is the recognition of the right of all nations, great or small, of whatever color or creed, to have the right to live and to develop their own characteristic civilization, provided that they do not thereby infringe the rights of others. The German, relinquishing his conception of the primacy of the German race, must recognize that the Pole and the Czech and the Jew have as much right as he, no more and no less, to a place in the world and to a share in the bounty of nature. Equally, the Briton must recognize that the same is true of the African or any other inhabitant of the British Empire. The German must concede to the Austrian the right to decide his own future. The Briton must equally concede the same right to the Indian.

¹ See also Herbert Morrison's Broadcast, London, November 27, 1939 (*Labour's Aims in War and Peace*, 1941, p. 36-8).

Thirdly, there must be a complete abandonment of aggression and of the use of armed force as an instrument of policy. War must be outlawed and the rule of law accepted. Where disputes cannot be amicably settled by negotiation, they must be submitted to the decision of disinterested arbitrators and their decision accepted.

Fourthly, there must be recognition of the rights of national, racial and religious minorities. While as far as possible every State should be left free to manage its internal affairs, there is a common interest in the prevention of oppression, and in the recognition of the rights of individuals. It may well be that later the principle of the recognition of the rights of the individual might be given still wider extension, and be firmly established as part of the law of nations. Here it is sufficient to lay down as a principle that where there are racial minorities in any State, there must be some effective authority by an international body over the sovereign rights of the individual State.

Fifthly, there must be acceptance of the principle that international anarchy is incompatible with peace, and that in the common interest there must be recognition of an international authority superior to the individual States and endowed not only with rights over them, but with power to make them effective, operating not only in the political, but in the economic sphere. Europe must federate or perish.

Sixthly, there must be abandonment of imperialism and acceptance of the principle that in the government of colonies and dependencies where self-government cannot yet be conceded, the interests of the natives must be paramount, and that there must be equal access for all nations to markets and raw materials. This can best be achieved by an extended and strengthened mandate system under international authority. We hold that the redistribution of colonial territories between rival imperialisms is no solution, for we do not admit that any nation has the right to hold others in subjection.

It will be seen that the acceptance of these principles will involve the creation of international machinery in order to make them effective. If aggression is to cease, there must be some force by which the aggressor can be compelled in the last resort to desist. If there is to be a rule of law, there must be a means of enforcing that law.

.

Bold economic planning on a world scale will be an imperative necessity to meet the post-war situation, and to avoid in the future recurrent economic crises. Only in this way can full benefit be taken of the achievements of science. Only an international authority can grapple

with this immense problem, which will, however, be eased by the very fact that the military considerations which were partly responsible for the cult of economic self-sufficiency will now be absent, while the abandonment of imperialism will lead to freer trade. International institutions for this purpose must be created.

It is of at least equal importance that the scope and authority of the International Labor Office should be enlarged. It should be given the task of preparing international minimum standards of wages, hours and industrial conditions, in order that, by increased production, by a more just distribution and by the wealth released from expenditure upon arms, the standard of living of the workers shall everywhere be raised. For peace depends on social justice within States, no less than on political justice between States.

.

We do not seek the destruction or the dismemberment of Germany. We wish no ill to the German people. We are ready to welcome them into the family of nations.

We declare our principles which are no different from those which we proclaimed at the time when Germany was prostrate after the last war.

We stand by our principles, not because of any weakness, but because of our confidence in the victory of our cause. We are ready whenever we are called upon to take responsibility for the government of the country, to do our utmost to get these principles accepted and put into effect.

Labour's Peace Aims, published by the Labor Party, London, p. 12-16; *Labour's Aims in War and Peace*, London, 1940, p. 196-210.

National Executive Committee of the Labor Party: Declaration of Policy, "Labor, War and the Peace," February 9, 1940

.

The Labor Party is convinced that the Allies ought not to enter into peace negotiations, except with a German Government which has not merely promised, but actually performed, certain acts of restitution. In view of the experience of recent years, no one can trust a Nazi Government honestly to perform such acts, or to abstain from future aggression.

Restitution must include freedom for the Polish and Czechoslovak peoples. No promise of independence for these peoples will suffice, unless accompanied by the withdrawal of the German forces and police.

The Austrian people, even earlier victims of Hitler's aggression, must be left free to decide, without intimidation or coercion, whether or not they wish to remain within the German Reich.

Recalling, moreover, the British Government's statement that "we seek no material advantage for ourselves," the Labor Party demands that undertakings shall be given to the German people that, in the general rearrangement after the war, the just and real interests of all the peoples will be respected, including those of the German people.

Whatever else may be contained in the peace treaty, this will assuredly not be the last war in Europe, unless, when this war ends, we can succeed in reconciling the French claim to security with the German claim to equality. If Britain is either inattentive or impatient towards either of these claims, she will already have incurred a share of responsibility for the next war.

The French people, who have suffered so often and so cruelly, must be assured of protection against violence and menace, and the German people must be given acceptable and peaceful outlets for their energy and ambition.

In reply to the just claim of the French, the Labor Party answers.

"We share your determination that this recurrent German menace, requiring these repeated mobilizations of the whole manhood of France, shall not plague your next generation and ours, if our strength and foresight can prevent it. Henceforth, in resistance to any German aggression, our two peoples must be not merely allies for a season, but brothers for all time."

In reply to the Germans, the Labor Party would say:

"We are opposed to any attempt from outside to break up Germany. We do not seek the humiliation or dismemberment of your country. We wholeheartedly desire to welcome you without delay into the peaceful collaboration of civilized nations. We must warn you, however, that Hitler and his system prepared and started this war. He could not continue it if you ceased supporting him. Until this accursed Nazi regime is overthrown, there is no hope of peace between us. But if you establish a Government sincerely willing that Germany shall be a good neighbor and a good European, there shall be no humiliation nor revenge."

History teaches that any attempt to keep Germany an outcast after this war, or to deprive her of such security as her neighbors rightly claim for themselves, will fail. The most farsighted and least dangerous policy is to seek to win the cooperation, as an equal partner, of a Germany governed by a political system whose aims and needs run parallel with ours.

.

Labor has always stood foursquare against aggression. We had hoped that Soviet Russia would join with the democracies for the collective organization of peace and resistance to aggression. We worked hard to that end. We condemned the clumsiness of the British Government in its earlier relations with the Soviet Union; but this cannot excuse the Russian Government's pact with the Nazis on the eve of the war, much less its unprovoked attack on Finland in shameless imitation of the Nazi technique in foreign policy. We should regard the extinction of the free Finnish democracy as an intolerable disaster for civilization.

Six years ago the Labor Party defined its purpose in foreign policy as "the building of a cooperative world commonwealth," and declared that "to have peace we must subordinate national sovereignty to world institutions and obligations." This is still Labor's peace aim.

The Labor Party, therefore, demands that the peace settlement shall establish a new association or commonwealth of States, the collective authority of which must transcend, over a proper sphere, the sovereign rights of separate States. This authority must control such military and economic power as will enable it to enforce peaceful behavior as between its members, and thus secure the all-round reduction of national armaments to the level required for the preservation of internal order.

All international disputes, wherever arising and of whatever sort, must be settled by peaceful means, through predetermined procedure of arbitration and conciliation.

The present close cooperation between the British Commonwealth, France, and their Allies in the political and economic spheres should be the nucleus of this wider association, membership of which should be open and advantageous to all nations

All nations, great and small, must have the right to live their own lives, free but cooperative, within the framework of the new world order.

Labor will be no party to imperialist exploitation, whether capitalist or other. Labor, therefore, demands that colonial peoples everywhere should move forward, as speedily as possible, towards self-government. In the administration of colonies not yet ready for self-government, the interests of the native population should be paramount and should be safeguarded through an extension and strengthening of the mandate system. There must be equal opportunity of access for all peaceful peoples to raw materials and markets in these colonial territories.

A new world order, which applies these principles, can only be securely founded on Socialism and Democracy. The necessary unity of purpose will be lacking if the peoples remain divided internally into two nations, sundered by wide differences of wealth, privilege, and opportunity.

Lasting peace depends on social justice *within* States, no less than on political justice between States. The necessary vigor and power of growth will be lacking if the individual citizen is treated as the slave of the State or is denied such freedom of opinion, speech, and faith as is compatible with the freedom of others. These elementary freedoms should constitute a new and world-wide Declaration of the Rights of Man.

A very grave economic crisis will confront all nations at the conclusion of this war, when the world's productive powers must once again be turned to peaceful ends. This problem of transition, unless handled with great skill and courage, may provoke mass unemployment and vast social catastrophes in every land. In addition to national policies of reconstruction, therefore, there must be bold economic and financial planning on a world-wide scale. International public works, conferring benefits on more than one nation, and covering also the comprehensive development of great colonial territories now divided between two or more colonial powers, as in Africa, must be undertaken through an International Authority with a budget and powers far greater than the League of Nations ever had. Such an authority must make full use of scientists and technicians. It must plan with vision and execute with efficiency.

The purpose of such schemes should be to make available greater abundance, both for the inhabitants of these areas and for all mankind. Further, to aid in raising the standard of living of workers in all lands, a new impetus must be given to the work of the International Labor Organization.

The ineffectiveness of the League, often quoted to discredit international cooperation, was partly due to the lack of conviction and sincerity of its leading Member States, and partly to its comparative neglect of economic questions. Successive British Governments, since 1931, have a heavy share of responsibility for its collapse. We must learn the lessons of experience and build better next time.

.
Labour's Aims in War and Peace, p. 89-93.

National Executive Committee of the Labor Party: Memoranda Presented to the Annual Party Conference: "The War and the Peace," August 4, 1941

The War

Since the Conference confirmed the decision of the Labor Party to enter the Government formed by Mr. Churchill heavy and grievous

blows have been suffered at the hands of the Axis Powers. The over-running of the Low Countries, the fall of France, betrayed from within even more than defeated from without, the abject capitulation of Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, are part of the price that has to be paid for the policy of appeasement and the abandonment of collective security ever since 1931 in the face of determined opposition from the Labor Movement.

It is certain that the road we still have to travel will be long and hard . . .

Nothing that has occurred in the year since the Conference last met has altered the judgment of our Movement on the purposes of the German and Italian dictators. We reaffirm our determination to fight until Nazism and Fascism are overthrown. We shall insist upon the making of a peace which restores freedom and independence to the conquered peoples. We shall demand the organization of such international institutions and controls as will put it finally beyond the power of the government of any country thereafter to embark upon aggression. The experience of these months has made it more, and not less, necessary to build by collective action decisive security against war as an instrument of national policy. In particular, the experience of massed populations subjected to violent and repeated air bombardment, striking equally at men and women, and at old and young, has demonstrated beyond all possibility of contradiction how intolerable an institution is modern war, and how completely it conflicts with all civilized progress and well-being.

We recognize, however, that it is not enough to deal with the symptoms of war. We must destroy in every land the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty. This paradox is incompatible with either true freedom or social democracy. It stimulates those evil ambitions which feed on insensate nationalism.

When this war is over we must recognize the fact that the world is now a single economic unit, that trade slumps, unemployment and poverty are international problems, that science has given us the power, if we choose to use it, to lift to new and higher levels the workers' standards of life throughout the world. To this end we must have international economic planning. The Labor Movement reaffirms its conviction that there is no road to enduring peace save by the growing acceptance of Socialist principles. No peace, therefore, which does not aim at a Socialist reconstruction of international society can be accepted by the Labor Party as adequate to the sacrifices involved in the defeat of Nazi and Fascist aggression.

The world now looks to this country for leadership. Our nation and its Government must prove worthy of that great task. The British Labor Movement cannot accept the persistence of conditions, in any part of the British Empire or its mandated territories, which are inconsistent with the principles for which we stand. The time has passed when any interest, however powerful, can be permitted to stand in the way of the unhampered use of our national resources. . . .

. . . We declare once more that we can have no part, directly or indirectly, in a policy of accommodation, and that the necessary prelude to a just peace is total victory. . . .

. . . After victory is won we shall strive to make that freedom and security the basis of an ampler and richer life for all mankind. This must mean not only international economic planning but an international authority possessing many powers hitherto exercised by a competing anarchy of national sovereignties.

Beyond the gates of victory the vision of a new, more just, and happier world rises before our eyes. The British Labor Movement calls to its members and to the workers of every land to play their full part, each according to their opportunities, in achieving the triumph of our common cause. We must march through victory to the international and democratic Socialist commonwealth.

The Peace

.

We note that all classes in our society, as at no time in our history, are united to assure to ordinary men and women the full implications of that victory for freedom and democracy for which we are fighting. Mass unemployment is intolerable in war; we must make it intolerable in peace. Distressed areas are incompatible with a full war effort; the organization which removes them for the purpose of war must remove them for the purposes of peace. Finance is the servant, and not the master, of political policy in war-time; it must continue in that relation when peace comes. In war our great material resources are not private empires to be administered for profit, but national assets to be efficiently administered for victory; they must be similarly administered as we turn from war to peace. The idea and the spirit which underlie the war effort imply the use of our human and material resources in the interest of the whole people and not of a part of the people. That idea and that spirit must animate the process of reconstruction. Our power to make

them inspire the nation then will depend upon the limits to which we apply them to the organization of victory now. That is what the nation expects; that, also, is what the nation must receive. For it is aware that each decision which gives priority to the national interest over private claims in war-time provides the basis for asserting the same principle when we turn from the grim tasks of war to the healing purposes of national restoration.

.

The central principle underlying the nation's war effort is that of equity. It is the central principle which must underlie the nation's peace effort also. The Labor Movement does not admit that there is one level of claim in the period of external danger, and a different level when that danger has been overcome. Whether it is the health of the people, or its housing; whether it is our educational system or our land system; whether it is the organization and use of our coal supplies and our transport; whether it is the treatment of the injured and the disabled or the care of old age; there can be no differentiation in response to claims which is not justified by the public welfare. . . .

.

. . . History has given us the opportunity to consecrate the sufferings of the world by fulfilling its hopes. That is the vision to which we must dedicate our lives. It is not only the debt we owe to the men and women who built our Movement; it is also our inescapable obligation to the sons and daughters of men who will follow us and whose lives will be shaped by the principles on which we build our effort. It is in that spirit we must go forward. There is no other highroad to a noble victory and a just and enduring peace.¹

The War and Peace, London, 1941.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister: Speech at the Annual Meeting of the Central Council of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations, London, March 26, 1942²

. . . I am perpetually asked to devote more time and attention to the rebuilding of the post-war world, and measures, all of them carefully

¹ See also *These Things Shall Be*, November 1941.

² For an earlier statement see Mr. Churchill's speech at the Annual Meeting of the Central Council, London, March 27, 1941 (*The Times*, March 28, 1941, p. 4; *N. Y. T.*, March 28, 1941).

thought out, have been taken to prepare for that longed-for period. But we must be, above all things, careful that nothing diverts our thoughts and energies from the task of national self-preservation and inter-Allied duty which will require the total concentration for an indefinite period of all that we can give.

I will not therefore enter on these subjects today except to say that a few weeks ago one of our leading intellectuals asked in public whether I was working for the new England or the old. It is an easy question to answer: we are working for both. Britain and the old Britain have always dwelt side by side in our land, and it is by the union and interplay of the new impulses and the great traditions both working together that we have managed to solve peacefully, yet finally, problems which have ruined the unity of many a famous State. . . . This is a very hard war. Its fearful problems reach down to the very foundations of human society. Its scope is world-wide and it involves all nations and every man, woman, and child in them. Strategy and economics are interwoven. Sea, land, and air are a single service. The latest refinements of science are linked with the cruelties of the Stone Age. The workshop and the fighting line are one. All may fall, all will stand together. We must confront our trials with that national unity which cannot be broken, and a national force which is inexhaustible. We must confront them with resilience and ingenuity which are fearless, and above all with that inflexible will-power to endure and yet to dare for which our island race has long been renowned. Thus, and thus alone, can we be worthy champions of that grand alliance of nearly 30 nations which without our resistance would never have come into being but which now has only to march on together until tyranny is trampled down.

In all this the Conservative Party has a vital part to play. Now is the time for all its characteristic qualities to come increasingly into action. Now is the time for it to impart in our affairs and our national life those elements of stability and firmness, that power to plough through the evil days till the whole result is gained. . . .

. . . As your leader, I shall hope that when the whole story has been told it will be said of the Conservative Party in Parliament and throughout the land: They strove for peace too long, but when war came they proved themselves the main part of the rock on which the salvation of Britain was founded and the freedom of mankind regained.

*Annual Conference of the Labor Party: Resolutions, London, May 25-28, 1942*¹

.

Victory

.

This Conference reaffirms its belief in the necessity for achieving total victory over our enemies. . . . We welcome with pride the Grand Alliance of the United Nations fighting for the liberties of the world.

.

A Planned Economic Democracy

.

This Conference affirms that there must be no return after the war to an unplanned competitive society, which inevitably produces economic insecurity, industrial inefficiency, and social inequality. It notes that the pressure of war has already necessitated far-reaching Government control of industry, central planning of the nation's economic life, and the subordination of many private interests to the common good, and urges that this process be carried further in order to achieve swift and total victory. It declares that measures of Government control needed for mobilizing the national resources in war are no less necessary for securing their best use in peace, and must therefore be maintained after final victory is won. It regards the socialization of the basic industries and services of the country, and the planning of production for community consumption, as the only lasting foundation for a just and prosperous economic order in which political democracy and personal liberty can be combined with a reasonable standard of living for all citizens.

The Conference therefore affirms that it is urgent to undertake without delay the necessary preparation for the vital changes here proposed.

.

¹ See the Report of the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party, February 28, 1942, *The Old World and the New Society*, published by the Labor Party, London, 1942.

Social Security

.

. . . In the view of the Labor Party there should be:

- (a) One comprehensive scheme of social security.
- (b) Adequate cash payments to provide security whatever the contingency.
- (c) The provision of cash payments from national funds for all children through a scheme of Family Allowances.
- (d) The right to all forms of medical attention and treatment through a National Health Service.

The Conference declares that adequate provision must be made from public funds, and not from private charity, for the dependents of all those who lose their lives and for those disabled in the War.

.

The International Situation

.

The Conference believes that our collaboration with the U.S.S.R. in this war of self-defense should be the basis of understanding in victory between our two nations. . . .

.

The Conference sends greetings to all the peoples of the United Nations now standing shoulder to shoulder against the ruthless aggressor States . . . It reaffirms its comradeship with the peoples of Australia and New Zealand . . . It salutes the gallant and untiring struggle of the Chinese people against the ruthless might of Japan. It rejoices in a renewed fellowship of arms with the great American people . . . It declares its solidarity with the oppressed peoples of Europe in their bitter struggle against the German Nazi and Italian Fascist tyrants, and its confidence that the day of revolution and reckoning is not far distant.

The Conference records its detestation of the sufferings inflicted upon the Jewish people. It reaffirms its determination that, in the new international order after the war, Jews shall enjoy civil, religious, and economic equality with all other citizens, and that international assistance shall be given to promote by immigration and settlement the Jewish National Home in Palestine.

The Conference fully accepts the common responsibility of the United Nations towards the oppressed peoples of Europe — the inno-

cent victims of a savage devastation, human and material, without parallel in history; a responsibility which will not come to an end with the cessation of hostilities. The Quislings must be rounded up; food and medical relief must be made immediately available to restore the health and vigor of the freed peoples; their political and economic institutions must be re-established in freedom.

The Conference affirms its conviction that all the Governments and peoples now joined in an unbreakable alliance against the rapacious and aggressive tyrannies in the East and West must continue in a new, closer, and enduring association after victory.

To fortify and develop the unity of spirit and singleness of mind which inspires the United Nations on the field of battle is the paramount duty of organized labor.

The Conference recognizes that, in its approach to the tasks of rebuilding the world on foundations of economic and social justice and permanent peace, the British Labor Movement has a special responsibility to the international working-class, within and through which the solidarity of the workers, cemented by the sacrifices and sufferings of these war years, will find permanent, effective, and decisive expression.

.

The Atlantic Charter

.

This Conference, whilst welcoming the Atlantic Charter as an expression of good intentions, but remembering that promises like "the World made safe for Democracy" were made during 1914-18 and were not honored, regrets that no indication has been given by the Government that during the present war the implications of the Charter will be implemented. Believing that such implementation is necessary, not only as an act of justice to people in this country but also that they will bring hope to the victims of Axis oppression inside and outside Fascist countries and assist materially in the shortening of the war, directs the National Executive Committee through the National Council of Labor, if possible, to bring all pressure to bear upon the Government to apply practically the spirit of the Charter in this country and the Empire¹ during the War.

.

¹ A declaration on India was made by the Labor Party and Trades Union Congress, August 12, 1942 (British Information Services).

Colonial Policy

This Conference considers that the time has arrived for a restatement of the principles of the Labor Party as applied to the government of the colonies and to the status of colonial peoples

This should be a charter of freedom for colonial peoples abolishing all forms of imperialist exploitation and embodying the following main principles: —

- (1) All persons who are citizens of the colonial commonwealth should be considered to possess and be allowed to enjoy equality of political, economic, and social rights in the same way as the citizens of Great Britain.
- (2) The status of colony should be abolished and there should be substituted for this that of States named according to the country in which they are situated and having an equal status with the other nations of the commonwealth.
- (3) In all colonial areas there should be organized a system of democratic Government, using the forms of indigenous institutions in order to enable the mass of the people to enter upon self-government by the modification of existing forms of colonial administration in conformity with these principles.
- (4) In all colonial areas, in Africa and elsewhere, where the primitive systems of communal land tenure exist, these systems should be maintained and land should be declared inalienable by private sale or purchase. All natural resources should be declared public property and be developed under public ownership.
- (5) A commonwealth council of colonial peoples should be set up on which each former colonial state should be represented in accordance with the number of its population, but giving also special attention to the representation of national groups within each State.

Report of the 41st Annual Conference of the Labor Party, London, 1942, p. 99, 110, 132, 151-3.

The Liberal Party: Resolution on International Affairs, Submitted by the Executive to the Assembly of the Liberal Party at Caxton Hall, London, September 4, 1942

This Assembly, conscious of its responsibility as the representative governing body of the Liberal Party, renews its pledge of support to His Majesty's Government in the prosecution of the war to a victorious

conclusion, believing that no sacrifice can be too great to defend our country and empire against the Axis Powers and to rid the world of lawless aggression. To this end, it urges H.M. Government to press on relentlessly with the organization and armament of our forces on land, at sea and in the air, and to lose no opportunity of integrating our strategy and supply with those of the Allied nations, as exemplified by the Prime Minister's visit to Russia, in order to attack and defeat the enemy with the least possible delay. But the Assembly is also deeply conscious of the fact that to win the war is only the first step in securing the elimination of armed aggression and an opportunity to build a world order founded upon the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter. Therefore, while recognizing the critical state of the war and the necessity for the utmost concentration upon victory in the field, the Assembly urges H.M. Government to prepare without delay, in concert with our allies, the necessary plans, first for maintaining order and ensuring relief in the countries devastated by the Axis in every quarter of the globe and secondly for laying the foundations of permanent security both in the political and economic fields. In particular, the Assembly considers that any effective post-war policy must primarily depend upon the closest cooperation between the British Empire, Russia, China and the other United Nations and especially with the United States and it welcomes enthusiastically the recent speech of Mr. Cordell Hull¹ with all that it implies. This Assembly demands that H.M. Government shall step forward boldly along the path of Anglo-American cooperation for world peace and prosperity without regard to vested interests or outworn political and economic dogmas. In this design the Government of the United Kingdom must shirk no responsibilities and cast no backward glances, but act with generosity, foresight and imagination.

This Assembly believes that four primary tasks of world organization must now be undertaken and that it is vital that plans agreed by the United Nations should be ready for immediate application with the coming of victory.

First among these tasks is the preservation of peace and the guarantee of security by an armed international organization which must be strong enough to coerce even a great power; must have the means of taking coercive action promptly; and must have authority to enforce the settlement of international differences.

Secondly, the organization of international justice must be made effective and all-embracing. The judicature must be assured of the un-

¹ See section United States, p. 99.

varying support of the international armed forces in enforcing its findings.

Thirdly, all colonial possessions throughout the world must come under the general control and protection of an international body. The guiding principles of the controlling authority must be (a) the well-being of colonial peoples, (b) "the open door," (c) the training of natives in the development of free institutions with the object of enabling them progressively to manage their own affairs.

Fourthly, if the new international political organizations are to work effectively, they must be protected against the unbearable strains and stresses of international economic anarchy. There must therefore be created a further independent international organization which shall be charged with two main duties (a) securing such an adjustment of rates of exchange as will create conditions of international trade equilibrium, (b) adjusting the rate of investment so as to maintain employment at a high level.

Whatever loss of sovereignty, burden of responsibility or financial obligation is entailed by the creation of all these international controls should be joyfully borne by this and every other country; but it will be for H.M. Government in particular to lead the way in Europe by precept and by example, recognizing as this Assembly is confident that the people of Britain recognize that, as during the war so after the war, no effort can be too great for the achievement of permanent political and economic peace.

Final Agenda for the Meeting of the Assembly of the Liberal Party,
issued by the Liberal Party Organization, London, 1942, p. 6-8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations of Sources referred to in text: Australia, *C.N.I.A.*, *Current Notes on International Affairs*; *B.I.N.*, *Bulletin of International News*; *Cong. Rec.*, *Congressional Record*; *D.A.F.R.*, *Documents on American Foreign Relations*; *D. S. Bul.*, *The Department of State Bulletin*; *I-A.R.*, *The Inter-Allied Review*; *I.L.O.*, *International Labor Office*; *N.Y.T.*, *New York Times*; *Parl. Deb.*, *Parliamentary Debates*; U.K., *United Kingdom*; U.S.S.R., *Inf. Bul.*, *Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Information Bulletin*; U.S., *United States*.

GENERAL

Allied Peace Aims. Treaties and Agreements London, National Peace Council, 1941, 26 p.

The Bulletin of International News, fortnightly, The Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, XVII, XVIII and XIX.

The Department of State Bulletin, weekly, Washington, D C

Foreign Affairs, quarterly, New York, Council on Foreign Relations.

Free Europe, fortnightly, London.

Free World, monthly, New York, Free World Association.

Geneva Research Centre, *Official Statements of War and Peace Aims*:

I. *European Belligerents, September 1, 1939 to August 31, 1940.*

II. *European Belligerents, September 1, 1940 to February 28, 1941.*

The Inter-Allied Review (*The United Nations Review* since Jan. 1943), a monthly Summary of Documents on the Allied Struggle for Freedom, New York, I, No. 1, Jan. 1941.

The Journal of Central European Affairs, University of Colorado, Denver, Col.

New Europe, monthly review of international affairs, New York.

THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

International Conferences of American States. Washington, D.C., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1940, II, 1933-40.

Preliminary Recommendation on Post-War Problems. Formulated by The Inter-American Juridical Committee and submitted to the Governments of the American Republics by the Governing Board of the Pan American Union. Pan American Union, Washington, Nov. 1942, 22 p.

Report of the Third Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, Rio de Janeiro, Jan. 15-28, 1942, submitted to the Governing Board of the Pan American Union by the Director General (Congress and Conference Series No. 36). Washington, 1942.

BELGIUM

Moniteur Belge, irregular, first issued in exile in Paris, May 18-30, 1940, first issued in London, Nov. 22, 1940.

News from Belgium, weekly, Belgian Information Center, New York (No. 1 appeared on Apr. 4, 1941).

BRITISH DOMINIONS

Australia

Current Notes on International Affairs. Department of External Affairs, Canberra.

Menzies, Robert Gordon, *A People's War*, speeches delivered in 1941. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1941, 143 p.

The Trade Unions and the War, reprints of broadcasts, Melbourne.

Canada

King, William Lyon Mackenzie, *Canada at Britain's Side*. Toronto, Macmillan Co., 1941, 332 p.

South Africa, Union of

Smuts, Jan Christian, *Plans for a Better World*. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1942, 288 p.

CHINA

Chiang K'ai-shek, *All We Are and All We Have*. Speeches and Messages, Dec. 9, 1941—Nov. 11, 1942. New York Chinese News Service, 1942.

Chiang, Mayling Soong (Madam Chiang K'ai-shek), *We Chinese Women*. Speeches and Writings during the First United Nations Year, Feb. 12—Nov. 16, 1942. New York, The John Day Co., 1943, 55 p.

China at War, monthly, China Information Publishing Co., P.O. Box 107, Chungking, China.

China Quarterly, The China Society of America, Inc., New York.

Chinese News Service, New York.

Contemporary China, a Reference Digest, fortnightly, Chinese News Service, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Beneš, Eduard, *The Way to Victory*. London, Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Information Service, 1942, 30 p.

The Central European Observer, semi-official Czechoslovak fortnightly review, London

News Flashes from Czechoslovakia under Nazi Domination Czechoslovak National Council of America, Chicago, Ill.

Ripka, Hubert, *Munich Before and After*. London, 1939.

Speeches of Jan Masaryk in America New York, The Czechoslovak Information Service, Sept 1942, 77 p. (Czechoslovak Sources and Documents, No. 1).

Struggle for Freedom. New York, The Czechoslovak Information Service, Mar. 1943, 138 p. (Czechoslovak Sources and Documents, No. 2).

FRANCE

Speeches by M. Daladier and M. Reynaud in December, 1939, London, 1940. U.K., Parl Pap., Cmd. 6159, France No. 1 (1940).

Le Temps, Paris.

FREE FRANCE (FIGHTING FRANCE)

Fighting France, Fighting France Information Bureau, Ottawa, Canada.

France, 1940-1942. A Collection of Documents and Bibliography, compiled by Howard C Rice, Cambridge, Mass., 1942, 221 p.

La France Libre, monthly, London (15 Queensberry Place, S.W. 7).

Free France, fortnightly, Free French Press and Information Service, New York, I, II.

GREECE

Greece Undaunted Still Fights On. Speeches and Addresses by King George II in the United States of America and Canada issued by the Greek Office of Information, New York, 1942.

The Greek White Book. Diplomatic Documents relating to Italy's Aggression against Greece, with a preface by Emmanuel Tsouderos. London and New York, Hutchinson, 1942, 121 p.

INDIA

Amery, Leopold C. M. S., *India and Freedom*. London, Oxford University Press, 1942, 122 p.

Halifax, Viscount, *The Indian Problem*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1942, 31 p.

India and the War. Statement by the Governor-General on October 17, 1939 in answer to the demand made by the Congress, so that it might determine its attitude to the war, for an exposition of the war aims of the British Government in relation to India. U K, Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6121.

— Cmd. 6129, Nov. 1939.

— Cmd. 6196, Apr. 1940

— Cmd. 6219. Statement issued by the Governor-General on Aug. 8, 1940, presented by the Secretary of State for India to Parliament, London, 1940.

— Cmd. 6235 Statement made by the Governor-General to the Indian Legislature, Nov. 20, 1940, London, 1940.

— Cmd. 6293. Text of announcement issued by the Governor-General of India, Jul. 22, 1941.

India (Lord Privy Seal's Mission). Statement and draft declaration by His Majesty's Government with correspondence and resolutions connected therewith, Apr. 1942, London, 1942, 30 p.

Indian Information, fortnightly, Principal Information Officer of Government of India, New Delhi, India. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6350.

MEXICO

Mexico News, semi-monthly. Mexico City, The International Press Service Bureau of the Department of State for Foreign Affairs.

National and International Problems Series, Department of State for Foreign Affairs, Bureau of International News Service, Mexico, 1941-42, Nos. 1-15.

NETHERLANDS AND NETHERLANDS INDIES

Emerson, Rupert, *The Netherlands Indies and the United States.* Boston, World Peace Foundation, 1942, 90 p.

Kleffens, Eelco N. van, *Juggernaut over Holland.* The Dutch Foreign Minister's Personal Story of the Invasion of the Netherlands. New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, 195 p.

Koninklijke Woorden, H. M. Koningin Wilhelmina (Speeches by Queen Wilhelmina), 10 Mei 1940—10 Mei 1941, Batavia-C, 1941.

The Queen Looks at the Future. Important Statements of H. M. Queen Wilhelmina on War and Peace Aims. The Netherlands Information Bureau, New York, 1942, 32 p.

NORWAY

News of Norway, issued by the Royal Norwegian Government's Press Representative in the United States, Washington, D C., I, No. 1, Jan. 17, 1941.

Norsk Tidend (Official Gazette), weekly. First in England, I, No. 1, Aug 30, 1940.

Norway and the War, September 1939—December 1940. Edited by Monica Curtis. Documents on International Affairs, issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1941, 154 p.

POLAND

General Sikorski's Speeches during the Visit to the United States, December, 1942. Polish Information Center, New York.

Polish Feature and News Service. Issued by the Polish Information Center, New York.

Polish Fortnightly Review, The Polish Ministry of Information, Washington.

The Polish Review, The Polish Information Center, New York.

Strasburger, Henryk, *The Core of a Continent, Problems of Central and Eastern Europe*. Philadelphia, James-Patten-Rowe Pamphlet Series, No 13, The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1943

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Information Bulletin, Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Washington, D.C , No. 1, Jul. 14, 1941.

Stalin, Joseph, *The War of National Liberation*. New York, International Publishers, 1942, 61 p.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America on the Principles Applying to Mutual Aid in the Prosecution of the War against Aggression, Washington, February 23, 1942. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6341, United States, No I (1942).

Agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America relating to the Bases Leased to the U.S. of America and Protocol . . . The Defense of Newfoundland. U K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6259, Treaty Series No. 2 (1941).

Agreement between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of the U.S.S.R. providing for Joint Action in the War against Germany (with Protocol), Moscow, July 12, 1941. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6304, Treaty Series No. 15 (1941)

Agreement and Military-Convention between the United Kingdom and Ethiopia, Addis Ababa, January 31, 1942. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6334, Ethiopia No. 1 (1942)

Agreements between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Belgian Government relating to the Belgian Congo in respect of Finance and the Purchase of Commodities, London, January 21, 1941 U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6248, Treaty Series No. 1 (1941)

The American Speeches of Lord Lothian, July 1939 to December 1940. London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1941, 145 p. (Published under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs).

Anglo-Greek Guarantee Agreement, July 12, 1939. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6072, 1939

Atlantic Charter. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6321, United States No. 3 (1941).

Britain Plans British Official Statements, Vol. II, September 1941 to September 1942. New York, British Information Services. (For Vol. I, see *Peace Aims*)

Britain's Peace Aims London, National Peace Council, 1942, 60 p.

Bulletins from Britain, British Information Services, R.C.A. Bldg., New York City.

Correspondence respecting the Policy of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in Connexion with the Use of Materials Received under Lend-Lease Act, London, September 10, 1941. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6311, United States No. 2 (1941).

Documents concerning German-Polish Relations and the Outbreak of Hostilities between Great Britain and Germany on September 3, 1939. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6106, Miscellaneous No. 9 (1939).

Exchange of Letters between the Prime Minister and General de Gaulle concerning the Organization, Employment and Conditions of Service of the French Volunteer Force, August 7, 1940. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6220, France No. 2 (1940).

Exchange of Letters between Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and General de Gaulle concerning Commercial and Economic Relations between the United Kingdom and the Cameroons under French Mandate, January 21, 1941. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6249, France No. 1 (1941).

Exchange of Letters between Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and General de Gaulle concerning Commercial and Economic Relations between the United Kingdom and French Equatorial Africa, May 20, 1941. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6281, France No. 2 (1941).

Exchange of Notes between the Government of the United Kingdom and Egypt, Cairo, May 26, 1941. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6305, Treaty Series No. 16 (1941).

Exchange of Notes regarding U.S. Destroyers and Naval and Air Facilities for the United States in British Transatlantic Territories. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6224, Treaty Series No. 21 (1940).

Halifax, Lord, *The Heritage of Freedom*. Extracts from speeches on Foreign Policy . . . The British Library of Information, New York. 10 p.

Inter-Allied Meeting held in London at St. James's Palace on June 12, 1941. Report of Proceedings, London, 1941. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6285, Miscellaneous No. 1 (1941) 15 p.

Inter-Allied Meeting held in London at St. James's Palace on September 24, 1941. Report, proceedings. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6315, Miscellaneous No. 3 (1941). 31 p.

International Labour Conference, New York, 1941 Report to the Minister of Labour. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6331.

Notes Exchanged between the British and Czech Government concerning British Policy in regard to Czechoslovakia, August 5, 1942. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6379.

The Outbreak of War, August 22—September 3, 1939. London, Ministry of Information, No. 1 (1939), 22 p.

Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons

Parliamentary Debates, House of Lords.

Peace Aims, British Official Statements, Vol. I, a chronological record from September 2, 1939 to September 24, 1941. New York, British Library of Information, 1941, 30 p. (For Vol. II, see *Britain Plans*.)

Punishment for War Crimes, The Inter-Allied Declaration . . . on January 13, 1942 and relative documents. London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1942, 16 p.

Speech by Mr. Eden, delivered at the Mansion House on May 29, 1941. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6289, Miscellaneous No. 2 (1941).

Speech by Viscount Halifax, His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington, March 25, 1941. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6264

The Times, London.

Treaty of Alliance between the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and Iran, Tehran, January 29, 1942. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6335, Persia, No. 1 (1942).

Treaty of Mutual Assistance between Great Britain and Poland. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6144, Treaty Series No. 58 (1939).

Treaty of Mutual Assistance between His Majesty in respect of the United Kingdom, the Prime Minister of the French Republic and the Prime Minister of the Turkish Republic, October 19, 1939. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6165, Treaty Series No. 4 (1940).

Treaty of Non-Aggression, June 12, 1940. U.K., Parl. Pap., Cmd. 6211, Thailand No. 1 (1940). Supplement Cmd. 6323, Jul. 19, 1941.

THE UNITED STATES

America's Peace Aims. London, National Peace Council, 1942, 46 p.
Christian Science Monitor, Boston.

Congressional Record, Washington, D.C.

The Department of State Bulletin, Washington, D.C.

Documents on American Foreign Relations, Vols. I-IV, Boston, World Peace Foundation, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942.

Grew, Joseph C., *Report from Tokyo.* A Message to the American People. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1942, 88 p.

Lend-Lease Act. Report on Operations. See list of reports, page 17 above.

The New York Times, New York City.

Toward New Horizons, Nos. 1-3. Washington, Office of War Information.

Welles, Sumner, *The World of the Four Freedoms*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943.

YUGOSLAVIA

Yugoslavia at War. Collection of official pronouncements. London, Yugoslav Government (Yugoslav Documents, No. 1, 1941, No. 2, 1942).

APPENDIX

THE CHURCHES

America's Peace Aims. A Committee Report by the Catholic Association for International Peace, Washington, 1941.

Beales, A. C. F. *The Catholic Church and International Order*. New York, Penguin Books, 1941.

Bulletin of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Vol. II, January–February 1942: "A Digest of Religious Statements on Peace and Post-War Reconstruction," New York.

Information Service, of the Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council of Churches, New York

N.C.W.C. News Service, issued by the Press Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.

Principles for Peace Selections from Papal Documents Leo XIII to Pius XII. Editor, Rev. Harry C. Koenig, S.T.D. Washington, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943, 894 p.

The Pope Speaks: the Words of Pius XII. Edited by Charles Rankin, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1940, 337 p.

Temple, Most Rev. William (Archbishop of Canterbury), *Christianity and Social Order*. New York, Penguin Books, 1942.

The Voice of the Churches, Representative Leaders and the War. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1940.

The World Society. Catholic Association for International Peace, Washington, 1942.

POLITICAL PARTIES

The British Labor Party

Attlee, Clement R. *et al.*, *Labour's Aims in War and Peace*. New York, Rand School Press, 1941, 153 p.

Bevin, Ernest, *The Job to Be Done*. London, Heinemann, 1942.

Labour's Achievements and the Goal. New York, British Library of Information, 1941.

The Old World and the New Society. London, The Labour Party, 1942, also published by the League of Industrial Democracy, New York, 1943.

Report of the Forty-first Annual Conference of the Labour Party. London, The Labour Party, 1942.

The Liberal Party

Final Agenda for the Meeting of the Assembly of the Liberal Party, issued by the Liberal Party Organisation, London, 1942.

INDEX

A

- Acheson, Dean, lend-lease aid in post-war reconstruction, 97
- Act of Havana concerning the Provisional Administration of European Colonies and Possessions in the Americas, 579
- Aggression:
- Anglo-Polish pact of mutual assistance, 460
 - forces against, work of, 385
- Aggressor nations, disarmament of, 209, 413, 433, 462, 472, 504, 544
- Agreements (*see also* Declarations and Treaties):
- Balkan Union (Greece and Yugoslavia), Jan 15, 1942, 535-8, 544-5
 - Belgium-United Kingdom, use of armed forces, 529
 - Canada-U.S., post-war economic settlements, 144
 - China-U.S., loan, 390-1
 - Ethiopia-United Kingdom, 226
 - Greece-Yugoslavia, 226, 535-8, 544-5
- lend-lease, with U.S.:
- Belgium, Jun. 16, 1942, 10, 529
 - China, Jun 2, 1942, 10, 392
 - Czechoslovakia, Jul 11, 1942, 10, 435
 - Greece, Jul 10, 1942, 10, 542
 - Netherlands, Jul. 8, 1942, 10, 513
 - Norway, Jul 11, 1942, 10, 497
 - Poland, Jul 1, 1942, 10, 478
 - U.S.S.R., Jun. 11, 1942, 10, 366
 - United Kingdom, Feb. 23, 1942, 10, 68
 - Yugoslavia, Jul. 24, 1942, 10, 556
- mutual aid (*see also* Lend-lease):
- United Kingdom-U.S.S.R., 208
 - Norway-United Kingdom, 490-1
 - Ogdensburg, Canada-U.S., 29
 - Poland-Czechoslovakia, confederation, Jan. 23, 1942, 467-9
 - Poland-U.S.S.R., on territorial changes in Poland, formation of Polish Army, and amnesty to Polish citizens, 354-5
- reciprocal-aid between Australia, Belgium, U.S. and French National Committee, New Zealand and United Kingdom, 10
- U.S.S.R.-Czechoslovakia, mutual aid, 353
- United Kingdom-Greece, on Greek armed forces, 538
- Air power, role of, 134
- Albania:
- attitude of Soviet Govt toward, 376-7
 - liberation of:
 - Eden, Anthony, statement on, 273
 - comment of Tsouderos, Emman- uel J., 546-7
 - Hull, Cordell, statement of, 146
 - Metaxas, Genl John, 531
- American democratic principles, 459
- American-Filipino relations, 558-9
- American Friends Service Committee, statement on dynamic peace, 629
- American Republics, 577-609 (*see also individual countries*):
- chronology, 602-5
 - conferences:
 - chronology, 577-8
- Amery, Leopold C. M. S.:
- India, Dominion, status for, 283, 286, 288, 298
 - Nazi victory, meaning of, to Indian hopes, 287
 - new Constitution for India, develop- ment of, 288, 299
 - unity in India, 295
 - Yugoslavia, need for unity in, 222
- Angarita, Isaias, pledge of Venezuela to assume its obligations, 605-6
- Anglo-American cooperation, 413, 685-6
- Anglo-Polish treaty of alliance, 447, 449
- Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, pro- gram of, 372-5, 659
- Anti-aggression front, 385-6, 389-90
- Arab peoples, 144

- Argentina, Wheat Meeting, preamble to draft convention for, 13
- Armaments, limitation of.
 - American advocacy of, 20, 34, 43, 104
 - American Rabbis, program of reconstruction, support of, 630
 - Inter-American Juridical Committee, recommendations of, 588
 - Pope Pius XII, statements of, 613, 622, 623
- Armistice
 - conditions of, 431, 440
 - decisions relating to reorganization of Europe at time of, 432
 - provisional scheme of security, decision on, 432
- Atlantic Charter:
 - application of Point 8, 430
 - British Labor Party statement on, 683
 - Chiang K'ai-shek's message to Indian people on support of, 390
 - China's support of, 390, 391-2
 - Churchill, Winston, statement on, 209, 210
 - Czechoslovak acceptance of resolution of Inter-Allied Meeting on, 412-3
 - definition of universality, by Manuel L. Quezon, 558
 - disarmament of Germany, 433
 - explanation of purposes by Netherlands Govt to People's Council of N.E.I., 511-12
 - first anniversary, message of Pres. Roosevelt to Prime Minister Churchill, 108
 - foundation of future organization of peace, 362
 - fourth point, question on reservation in, by Foreign Minister of Netherlands, 509-10
 - Hull, Cordell, statement on, 45
 - Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept. 24, 1941:
 - resolution, text of, 3
 - Free French National Committee representative, speech by René Cassin, 568-70
 - Greek Prime Minister, approval of, 534-5
 - Norwegian Foreign Minister, speech of acceptance of, 492-3
 - Polish Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, speech of acceptance of, 461-3
 - Soviet Ambassador to United Kingdom, Ivan Maisky, speech by, 356
 - Yugoslav Foreign Minister, speech by, 548-9
 - I.L.O. Conf., endorsement by, 6
 - King George II of Greece, security for the state, 540-1
 - Message to Congress by Pres. Roosevelt, 45
 - Mexico's acceptance of principles of, 598
 - misunderstanding of name, 558
 - Philippines, adherence to, 557
 - Polish-Czechoslovak joint declaration, Sept. 24, 1941, 464-5
 - resolution of Third Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American Republics, 585
 - statement by Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston S. Churchill, 44
 - text, 2
 - universal applicability of, 321
 - Yugoslavia, acceptance of, in joint statement of King Peter II and Pres. Roosevelt, 555-6
- Attlee, Clement R.:
 - disarmament, moral, 670-1
 - economic post-war planning, 672-3
 - German people, future of, 670
 - labor movement, principles of, 192
 - national and international peace aims, 197, 670
 - principles of European settlement, 669-71
 - social justice, peace based on, 194, 219
 - war crimes, punishment of, 217
- Australia, 315-26:
 - chronology, 315
 - Constitution, bill to alter, text, 325
 - Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 - reciprocal-aid agreement with U.S., 10
 - Wheat Meeting, preamble to draft convention for, 13
- Austria.
 - evacuation of Germany from, 418
 - independence of, 674
 - liberation of:
 - Churchill, Winston, 226
 - Eden, Anthony, 256
 - relation to Czechoslovak-Polish Confederation, 417
- Autonomy, national, 631
- Aviation, international, 529

Avila Camacho, Manuel
 aggrandizement, condemnation of, 595
 continental doctrine of equality, right
 and justice, 592
 democratic equality of nations, 595,
 597
 friendly cooperation of states, 595
 independence for France, 602
 intercontinental commerce, 599, 601
 international policy of Mexico, 595
 non-intervention in affairs of other
 states, 595
 peace, universality of, 595
 relations with Vichy France, severance
 of, 602
 rights of nations, respect for, 595, 598
 war with Germany, Italy and Japan,
 597

Axis Powers *See individual countries*

B

Balance of power, dangers of, 445
 Balkan federation, 408, 417
 Balkan Union:
 agreement between Greece and Yugo-
 slavia on, 535-8, 544-5
 Bulgarian refusal to collaborate in, 534
 Greek Minister of Education's state-
 ment on, 544-5
 organs of, political, economic, financial
 and military, 536-7
 statement of King Peter II of Yugo-
 slavia on, 553
 Baltic-Aegean confederation, 409
 Batista, Fulgencio:
 address to U.S. Congress, 608-9
 Atlantic Charter, importance of, 609
 good neighbor policy of U.S., 608
 political system of future, 609
 reconstruction of world, 609
 Bech, Joseph:
 address before Committee on Foreign
 Affairs of U.S. House of Representa-
 tives, 503-5
 Germany, permanent disarmament of,
 504
 Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept. 24, 1941:
 resolution on Atlantic Charter,
 speech of acceptance of, 502-3
 small states, rights of, 504
 war with Germany, Italy and Japan,
 504

Belgium, 523-30
 armed forces in United Kingdom,
 agreement on, 529
 chronology, 523-4
 German war crimes, inter-Allied dec-
 laration on, 7
 Jews, declaration condemning German
 policy of exterminating, 14
 Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 lend-lease agreement with U.S., 10, 529
 peace proposal, reply of King George
 VI, 166
 pledge of Pres. Roosevelt to restore
 self-government, 67
 reciprocal-aid agreement with U.S., 10
 Beneš, Eduard:
 blocs in Europe, 416
 British Commonwealth of Nations,
 federal character of, 426
 collective security, European need
 for, 420
 confederation of Europe:
 message to Czechoslovak State
 Council, 439-44
 problems of, 418-20, 425-30
 democratic system for Europe, 411
 economic collaboration of nations, 407
 Europe, political reorganization of,
 425-30, 444
 European states, political equality of,
 429
 federal character of U.S., 426
 federal units in Europe, 406
 Germany:
 federation of, 410
 Prussia, division of, 416
 regeneration of, proposals for, 432-3
 treatment of, 416
 human rights, charter of, 420
 Hungary, re-education of, 434
 League of Nations, rebuilding of, 406
 liberation of Czechoslovakia, 406, 409
 minorities, rights of, 428, 434, 438-9,
 446
 population-transfers, 428, 446
 principles in post-war European order,
 428-30
 small states of Europe, proposals for
 post-war position of, 406, 425-30
 states, moral and legal equality of,
 410-11
 territorial questions, 444
 U.S. participation in post-war Euro-
 pean reconstruction, 445

- Beneš, Eduard — *Continued*
 "what we are fighting for," 430-2
 world commonwealth, essential to
 European confederation, 429
 Yugoslavia, friendship of Czechoslo-
 vakia with, 422
- Berle, Adolf A., Jr.:
 America's role in post-war world, 23
 international economic system, 123
 Italy, position of, 135
 people's war, 69
 relief and assistance to Greece, promise
 of, 78
 relief measures, American participa-
 tion in, 44
 small nations, rights of, 57
- Bevin, Ernest:
 exploitation, end of, 229
 labor, rights of, 210
 social security, 193
- Boundaries, provisional settlement of,
 665
- Brazil:
 adherence to Joint Declaration by
 United Nations, 1
 cooperation for democratic ideals, 606
- British Commonwealth of Nations, 155-
 350 (*see also subject headings and
 individuals*):
 Australia, 315-26
 Canada, 301-15
 chronology, 155-7
 federal character of, 426
 India, 278-300
 model for international organization,
 452, 456
 New Zealand, 326-40
 Union of South Africa, 340-50
- British Labor Party:
 aggression of Axis Powers, resistance
 to, 668
 colonial peoples, self-government of,
 675-6
 declaration of policy, 673-4
 German people, no quarrel with, 668
 imperialism, post-war, 675
 Jewish people, protest on treatment of,
 682
 manifesto of Sept 1, 1939, 668
 National Executive Committee:
 "Labor, War and Peace," declara-
 tion of policy, 671
 memoranda on "The War and the
 Peace," 676-9
- peace settlement, principles of, 672
 peoples, respect for all, 674
 resolutions of annual conference, 1942
 Atlantic Charter, 683
 colonial policy, 684
 economic democracy, planned, 681
 social security, 682
 victory, achievement of total, 681
 resources of nation, use of, 678-9
 socialism and democracy in new world
 order, 675, 677
 unemployment in post-war period, 677
 world commonwealth, cooperative, 675
- Bulgaria:
 aggression against Yugoslavia, 551-2
 future of, 439
 refusal to collaborate in Balkan Union,
 534
 Rumania, territorial dispute with, 190
- Butler, Richard A., Christian civiliza-
 tion, preservation of, 169

C

- Canada, 301-15.
 agreement with principles in Art. VII
 of lend-lease agreement between
 U.S. and United Kingdom, 10
 chronology, 301
 economic settlements, agreement on
 post-war, 144
 Mackenzie King, statement of, 311
 Hyde Park Declaration, 304
 Joint Declaration by United Nations,
 1
 U.S.:
 Joint Economic Committees, 41
 Ogdensburg Agreement, 29, 42, 304
 Wheat Meeting, preamble to draft
 convention for, 13
- Canterbury, Archbishop of:
 Lang, Most Rev. Cosmo Gordon,
 broadcast on justice in peace settle-
 ment, 641
- Temple, Most Rev. William:
 Church, function of, in peace plans,
 645
 Malvern Conference conclusions,
 643
 Washington Cathedral service,
 broadcast to, on economic justice
 and Christian fellowship, 644-6
- Cartels, international control of, 83

- Cassin, René
 commodities, priority on certain, 570
 distribution of foodstuffs, 571
 Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun 12, 1941,
 speech on resolution, 567
 international order, foundation of, on
 Lincoln's formula, 568
 transport of raw materials to France,
 post-war, 570
- Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, state-
 ment on victory and peace, 636-9
- Catholic Association for International
 Peace, report of Committees of, on
 world society, 631-6
- Catroux, Genl Georges.
 declaration to people of Syria and the
 Lebanon, 567
- Cavell, Edith, 403
- Central and Eastern European Planning
 Board (Czechoslovakia, Greece, Po-
 land and Yugoslavia), Joint Declara-
 tion, Jan. 14, 1942, 8
- Central European federation.
 Czechoslovak Secy. of State, statement
 on, 407-8
 Polish National Council
 general war aim of, 481-2
 resolution on, 476
- Chamberlain, Neville
 Anglo-French unity of purpose, 180
 defense of homeland, 187
 Europe, key to world peace, 168
 freedom, defense of, 162
 Germany as chief aggressor, 172
 international system, stable, 159
 international trade, restoration of, 177
 Nazi Govt., destruction of, 157
 New Europe, description of, 167
 responsibility for the war, 160, 176
 war aims, 178
- Charity, universal, law of, 610
- Chiang K'ai-shek:
 Atlantic Charter, support of, 390,
 391-2
 equality of status of China, 401-2
 independence of China, 387
 India, message to people of, 388-90
 Korean independence from Japan, 400
 message of good will to Pres Roose-
 velt, 400
 message to *New York Herald Tribune*
 Forum, 659
 "New Order for Greater Eastern
 Asia," smashing of, 380
 political, social and economic justice,
 403
 political system adapted to strains of
 war, 381
- Chiang K'ai-shek, Madame:
 freedom for China, fight for, 393-6
 international police force, desirability
 of, 395
 racial equality, hope for, 395
- China:
 aggressors, punishment of, 395
 anti-aggression front, 385-6, 389-90
 assistance to, 386
 Atlantic Charter, support of, 390,
 391-2
 chronology, 378
 collective security, machinery for,
 398-9
 cooperation with other nations, 386,
 390
 durable peace, establishment of, 387
 dynamic war, 387
 economic reconstruction, post-war, 382
 education of people for defense, 383
 enforced peace, concept of, 403
 equality of status, 401-2
 extraterritorial rights in, relinquinsh-
 ment by:
 United Kingdom, 120, 263, 401
 U S, 120, 400
 financial aid from U S, 390-1
 freedom for mankind, 400
 international police force, demand for,
 395
 isolationism, opposition to, 403
 Japan, relations with:
 reasons for fighting, 390-1
 statement of, by Chiang K'ai-shek,
 380
 Japanese imperialism in, 384-6, 401
 Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 justice and morality, vindication of,
 388
 Kuomintang, aim of, 381
 leadership in Asia, 403
 "League to Enforce Peace" plan in
 post-war world, 396-7
 League of Nations, attitude on, 393
 lend-lease agreement, with U S, 10,
 392
 loan agreement with U S., 390-1
 Manchurian conflict, 394
 mutual aid agreement with U S *See*
 Lend-lease.

China — *(continued)*

- national defense of, 381
- new order in Orient, 387, 394-5
- post-war collaboration, faith in, 393
- racial equality, hope for, 395
- regional blocs, repudiation of idea of, 403
- revolution, success of, 401-2
- revolutionary peace, 387
- role in new Pacific, 121
- struggle for human decency and international order, 378-9
- Three People's Principles, 380, 383, 401
- United Nations, Joint Declaration by, 1
- war crimes, punishment of, 387-8
- war, prosecution of, 401, 402
- Western Hemisphere, relations with, 386
- Western imperialism in, 403
- Christian concept of state, 610-12, 626
- Chronologies. *See individual countries*
- Church of England, Malvern Conference, conclusions, 643
- Churches, 610-46
- Churches in England, letter of agreement by:
 - five standards on economic situations, 642-3
 - Pope Pius XII's Five Peace Points, acceptance of, 641-2
- Churchill, Winston.
 - Anglo-American association of interests, 190, 223
 - Atlantic Charter, 2, 209, 210
 - Austria, restoration of freedom, 226
 - Battle of Britain, 186
 - British Empire, non-liquidation of, 264
 - Conservative and Unionist Associations, statement on winning the war, 679-80
 - Czechoslovakia, restoration of freedom, 191, 201
 - Denmark, restoration of freedom, 228
 - France, liberation of, 187, 189
 - French people, message to, 192
 - Germany, treatment of, 209
 - hostages, execution of, statement on, 218
 - India.
 - Cripps mission to, 288
 - self-government in, 211
 - situation in, 299

- liberty of British people, restoration of, 194
- Nazism, destruction of, 191, 193, 207
- Norway, restoration of freedom, 202
- occupied countries, liberation of, 193, 206
- Pacific war, promise of aid to U S in, 265
- Poland, restoration of freedom, 201
- rights of the individual, 158, 183, 184
- social justice, 201
- Spain and Portugal, policy toward, 264
- Syria, independence of, 211
- territorial conquests, non-recognition of, 190
- U S S.R., aid to, 207
- victory as primary aim, 183
- war crimes, punishment of, 256
- Ciechanowski, Jan:
 - economic doctrines, modernized, 458
 - Four Freedoms, 457
 - international organization of states, 458
 - tariff system, low, 458
- Citizen, safeguarding of, from undue interference by government, 518
- Collective security:
 - Bené's proposal, 411
 - China's attitude toward, 392-3
 - machinery for, 398-9
 - need for, 316, 420
 - resolution of Rio Conference, 584
 - system of, 525
- Colombia, Pan American solidarity, 606
- Colonial administration, international, statements by.
 - British Labor Party, 684
 - British Liberal Party, 686
 - Catholic Assoc. for International Peace, 632
 - Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, 628
 - Nash, Walter, 334-7
 - Smuts, Field Marshal J C, 348-50
- Colonial peoples, treatment of, 107, 169, 211, 244, 271, 629
- Colonies, French. *See French National Committee*
- Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes, 114
- Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace, guiding principles of, 634-6

- Committees of Socialist Action of Occupied France, 574
- Communication, international, 630
- Confederation of Europe *See* European federation
- Confederation, Polish-Czechoslovak agreement for, text, 467-9
communiqué issued on first anniversary of joint declaration, 420-1
- Conservative Party of Great Britain, 679-80
- Continental defense and solidarity of Western Hemisphere, 582, 593, 599, 606, 607, 639
- Costa Rica
continental defense, 607
Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
- Court of Justice, International *See* International Court of Justice
- Cranborne, Viscount.
colonial policy, 271
empire, unity of, 246
Germany, treatment of, 234
international police force, 238
relief and reconstruction, 239, 272
- Cripps, Sir Stafford:
appeal to U S for understanding of Indian problem, 296
India, mission to.
proposal presented to Indian leaders, text of, 290
broadcast regarding, 292
report on, 295
moral issue of war, 251
peoples' war of liberation, 230
- Croatia, creation of, by Germany, 427
- Cuba:
Atlantic Charter, importance of, 609
good neighbor policy of U S., 608
Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
political system of future, 609
reconstruction of world, 609
- Cultures, freedom in development of, 629
- Curaçao:
conference on post-war position, 512-13
constitution of, 512
- Currency, international, 49
- Curtin, John:
British Commonwealth of Nations, Australia as integral part of, 320
United States, broadcast to, 319
- Czechoslovak-Polish confederation, 417, 420-1, 467-9
- Czechoslovak State Council:
message of Beneš on confederation of Europe, to, 439-44
- Czechoslovak-Yugoslav friendship, 553
- Czechoslovakia (*see also* Beneš, Eduard):
administration of country, decentralization of, 435
boundaries, Munich, non-recognition of, by British Govt., 253, 410, 436-7
chronology, 404-6
constitution, revision of, 435
cooperation with Allies in winning peace, 434-5
decentralized constitution in post-war period, 427
European confederation, proposals for, 419, 425-30, 439-44
federation of Europe, 406
Fighting France, exchange of notes with, 438, 442, 574
foreign policy after restoration of Republic, 441-4
frontiers, natural, 439
German war crimes, inter-Allied declaration, 7
Germany, quarantine of, 416
Henleinism, 438
Herrenvolk rule over non-German peoples, repudiation of, 425
Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941, declaration by Jan Masaryk on cooperation, 411
Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept. 24, 1941.
resolution on Atlantic Charter, speech of Jan Masaryk on adoption of, 412-13
internal reconstruction, plan for, 434-5
invasion by Germany, 406
Jews, declaration condemning German policy of exterminating, 14
Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
joint declaration on post-war reconstruction by delegates at I L O Conference, 414-15
joint declaration, with Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, Jan. 14, 1942, 8
lend-lease agreement, with U S., 10, 435
military units in U.S.S.R., agreement, 353
minorities, policy on German and other, 428, 434, 438-9, 446
mistakes of past, 425
Munich Agreement. *See that title.*

Czechoslovakia — *Continued*

- Nazism, destruction of, 412
- party organization, 434
- pledge of Pres. Roosevelt to restore self-government, 67
- Poland:
 - confederation, agreement for, Jan. 23, 1942, 467-9
 - joint communiqué, 435-6
 - joint declaration, Nov. 11, 1940:
 - statement by Stronski, 453-4
 - text, 452-3
 - joint declaration, Sept. 24, 1941, accepting Atlantic Charter as basis of new European order, 464-5
- property, non-recognition of the transference of, declaration of, 421
- recognition of, by Great Britain, 410
- restoration of freedom:
 - Beneš, Eduard, 406, 409
 - Churchill, Winston, 191, 201
 - Eden, Anthony, 188
 - Roosevelt, Franklin D., 67
- role in new Europe, 434-5
- Slovaks, 409, 439
- small states, post-war position of, 425-30
- Sudeten Germans. *See that title.*
- territorial integrity recognized by French National Committee, 574
- U.S.S.R.:
 - friendly relations with, 440
 - mutual aid, 353
 - plea for assistance to, 413
- United Kingdom statement in Eden letter to Masaryk on repudiation of Munich and subsequent frontiers of, 253, 410, 436-7
- United Nations' aid, importance of, in reconstruction of Europe, 445
- United Nations, Joint Declaration by, 1
- war with Germany, 406
- Western democracies, cooperation with, 413
- Yugoslavia, pledge of friendship by Beneš to, 422

D

- Daladier, Edouard.
 - aggression, war against, 560

- defense of France, 559
- territorial conquests, fallacy of, 561
- war, imposition of, 560
- Western culture, fight for, 560
- Danubian federation, 407, 408
- Declarations (*see also* Inter-Allied Meetings):
 - Atlantic Charter. *See that title.*
 - Central and Eastern European Planning Board, General Steering Committee, 7
 - Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, joint, Jan. 14, 1942, 8
 - German policy of extermination of Jewish race, 14
 - German war crimes, adopted by representatives of 9 occupied countries, 7
 - government, employers', and workers' delegates of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia, I.L.O. Conf., 414-15
 - Hyde Park (Canada-U.S.), 304
 - non-recognition of the transference of property, by Czechoslovak Govt., 421
 - Poland-Czechoslovakia, joint, Sept. 24, 1941, 464-5
 - U.S.S.R.-Poland, mutual aid, 361
 - United Nations, Joint, by:
 - Chinese plea to Indian people in support of, 390
 - Mexican adherence, 598
 - text, 1
 - Yugoslav acceptance of, 555-6
- de Gaulle, Genl. Charles:
 - agreement between Free French and underground movement in France, 574
 - coalition of private interests in opposition to national interests, overthrow of, 572
 - elections, after liberation of France, 573
 - freedom of thought, belief and action, 572
 - French Empire, restoration of, 571
 - German aggression, guaranty against, 572
 - letter from Prime Minister Šrámek of Czechoslovakia, 438
 - liberty, equality and fraternity, application of ideals of, 572
 - liberty of French people, restoration of, 571

- mechanical organization of mankind'
 - destruction of, 572
- Munich Agreement, letter to Msgr. Jan Šrámek, concerning, 574
- National Assembly, election of, 571
- national security, 572
- Nazism, elimination of, 572
- right of individual to self-determination, 572
- security for all Frenchmen, 572
- Syria and Lebanon, grant of independence to, 566
- war crimes, punishment of, 572
- world organization for solidarity of nations and mutual aid, 572
- Dejean, Maurice, liberation of France, 565
- Demobilization, 73
- Democracy, principles of, 630
- Democratic countries, alliance of, 361
- Democratic principles:
 - Chinese faith in, 393
 - preservation of, 563
- Denmark:
 - freedom, restoration of, 228
 - pledge of Pres. Roosevelt to restore self-government, 67
- Deported populations, 481
- Dewey, Thomas E.:
 - economic life, changes in, 648
 - organization of world, necessity for, 647-8
 - production, increase of, 648
 - responsibility and power of America, 648
- Disarmament (*see also* Armaments, limitation and control of):
 - aggressor nations, treatment of, 209, 413, 433, 462, 472, 504, 544, 665
 - comparative, 529
 - essential feature of lasting peace, 179
 - Germany, 495, 504
 - Hoover proposals, 666
 - universal, 562, 629
- Disputes, settlement of, by third-party judgment, 629
- Dominican Republic, Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
- Drang nach Osten*, smashing of, 442, 470
- Dupong, Peter:
 - Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941, resolution of solidarity in war and collaboration in peace, 501-2
- East Prussia, 483
- Eastern Europe:
 - importance of, in European organization, 182
 - territorial adjustments, 190
- Economic anarchy:
 - British Liberal Party, resolution, 686
- Economic internationalism, 541, 631, 657
- Economic nationalism, 628
- Economic policies:
 - cooperation:
 - Canada and U.S.:
 - agreement, 144
 - Joint Economic Committees, 41
 - Great Britain and U.S., 60
 - Greek collaboration, 541-2
 - world-wide, 200, 204
 - democracy, application of principles of, 434
 - equality of opportunity, 43, 44, 56, 58, 103
 - lend-lease agreements as basis of world-wide economic system, 68, 96
 - proposed international organization, 628, 632
 - reconstruction.
 - America's role in, address of Henry A. Wallace, 147
 - distribution and purchasing power, problem of, 89
 - Inter-Allied Meeting, resolution, 4
 - principles laid down by Secy. Hull, 39
 - relief and demobilization. *See* Relief measures.
 - reserve stocks, 213
 - standard of living, need to raise, 86, 106, 230, 231, 247, 251, 266, 329
 - study of problems by I.L.O., 241
 - trade policies, liberalization of, 22, 26, 85, 106, 195
 - wheat production and distribution, regulation of, 13, 248
 - social control of production, 274, 310
 - war-time machinery, use of, in transition period, 124
- Economic and social security:
 - speech by Prime Minister Dupong of Luxemburg, 501-2
- Economic warfare, renunciation of, 627
- Eden, Anthony:
 - Albania, restoration of freedom, 273

- Eden, Anthony — *Continued*
 Anglo-American friendship, development of, 250
 Anglo-Soviet collaboration, 223
 Austria, liberation of, 256
 Czechoslovakia, restoration of freedom, 188
 Economic cooperation, 202
 Ethiopia, independence of, 196
 France, restoration of freedom, 245
 Germany, treatment of, 209
 Greek-Yugoslav agreement, statement on, 226
 International Court of Justice, 253
 international police system, 233
 Iran, withdrawal of forces from, 209
 Jews, crimes against, punishment for, 273
 Munich Agreement, denunciation of, in letter to Jan Masaryk, 253
 Nazism, destruction of, 207
 Poland, liberation of, 207
 relief and reconstruction, 212, 217
 social advancement, 233
 U.S.S.R., treaty with, statements on, 238, 243
 U.S., association with, 218
 unity in Europe, war to create, 159
 war crimes, punishment of, 257
 world organization, essentials of, 268
 El Salvador, Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 Embargoes, renunciation of, 627
 Emigration, 620
 Epirus, Northern, problem of, 546
 Equality of peoples. *See* Racial equality.
 Ethical principles in post-war world, 543
 Ethiopia:
 agreement with United Kingdom, 226
 adherence to Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 independence of, statement of Anthony Eden on, 196
 Europe:
 economic organization of, 631
 economic policy in past 20 years, 423
 liberation of, 490
 political reorganization of, 431
 post-war economic needs. *See* Economic policies and Inter-Allied Meetings.
 re-education in totalitarian countries of, 424-5
 European colonies and possessions in the Americas, convention on, 579-81
 European federation:
 Beneš proposal for, 419-20, 425-30
 Germany, position of, 432-3
 Masaryk, Jan, broadcast of, 415
 Rackiewicz, broadcast by, 479-80
 variants of, 408, 528
 European reconstruction
 consumption goods for Europe, 496
 economic needs of post-war Europe.
 consultative bureau, 493-4
 resolution of Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept 24, 1941, 4 (*see also* Inter-Allied Meeting)
 objectives, 331-2
 planned economy, 459
 policy since World War I, 423
 sovereignty of states in work of, 427
 United Nations aid in, 445
 U.S. participation in, discussed by Beneš, 445
 European Union, 631
 Evatt, Herbert V :
 Anglo-Soviet alliance, 320
 Atlantic Charter, universal application of, 321
 Constitution of Australia, need to alter, 323
 economic and social justice, planning for, 323
 future Pacific policy, 323
 Extraterritorial rights in China:
 relinquishment of —
 by Great Britain, 120, 263, 401
 by U.S., 120, 400, 401
- F
- Far East:
 American readiness to discuss situation, 20
 Outline of Proposed Basis for Agreement between U.S. and Japan, 57
 Faroe Isles, cooperation of Norway with, 489
 Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, message of National Conference of leaders on world government, system of, 627
 Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, statement, 640

- Federalism:
 - British Commonwealth of Nations, as example of, 426
 - U S model, 426
- Federation of Nations (*see also* World organization)
 - Lord Lothian's idea of, 173
 - spontaneous demand by peoples for, 496
- Fighting France *See* France, Fighting and Free French National Committee
- Finance
 - American resources to establish international currency, use of, 49
 - Axis vs Allied system, 127
 - controls, war-time, retention of, 228
 - costs of war, allocation of, 93
 - credits, post-war, 516
 - foreign exchange, stabilization of, 75, 516
 - international organization of, 39, 125, 204
 - price-fixing, 247
- Finland, Norwegian Govt's relation to, 492
- Food. *See* Relief, planning for
- Force, use of, 396-7
- Forced laborers, 481
- Fotitch, Konstantin, Bulgarian-Yugoslav relations, letter to *The Washington Star*, 551-2
- Four Freedoms:
 - definition of —
 - by Beneš, Eduard, 430-2
 - by Pres Roosevelt in —
 - Annual Message, Jan 6, 1941, 33
 - Annual Message, Jan 6, 1942, 66
 - message on Nazi atrocities, Jul. 17, 1942, 99
 - by Vice-Pres. Wallace, 82
 - by Welles, Sumner, 142
 - Greece, approval of, by King of, 540
 - Polish acceptance of, 456
 - realization, in Netherlands, 519
 - statements on:
 - Quezon, Manuel L., 559
 - Willkie, Wendell L., 657
- Fourteen Points, The, acceptance by U S., 654, 657
- France, 559-76 (*see also* de Gaulle, Charles and Free French National Committee):
 - aggression of Germany against, 569
 - appeal of Pres. Roosevelt to people, 130
 - declaration of unity of purpose with United Kingdom, 179
 - Empire, reconstitution of, 575
 - Franco-British Union, proposal for, 185
 - internal resistance, 573-4
 - liberation of.
 - Churchill, Winston, 187, 189
 - Eden, Anthony, 245
 - Roosevelt, Franklin D., 67, 131
 - Welles, Sumner, 139
 - "New European Order," repudiation of, 568
 - pledge of United Kingdom to, 184
 - position of, in post-war Europe, 432
 - pre-armistice statements, 559
 - Protestant Federation of, 646
- France, Fighting, 563-76 (*see also* de Gaulle, Charles and Free French National Committee)
 - chronology, 563-5
 - letter to Genl de Gaulle from Msgr. Šrámek in support of, 438
- Fraser, Peter, support of Britain, 327
- Freedom from fear, 412, 493
- Freedom of the seas, statements by:
 - Eden, Anthony, 203
 - Knox, Frank, 49
 - Roosevelt, Franklin D., 47, 53
- Freedom from want, 412, 493
- Free French National Committee (*see also* de Gaulle, Charles, France and France, Fighting):
 - Allied landings in North Africa, 575
 - British Labor Party, attitude toward, 674
 - colonial territories, common administration of, 576
 - Committees of Socialist Action of Occupied France, support of Genl. de Gaulle by, 574
 - Czechoslovakia, alliance with, basic post-war policy, 574
 - Franc-Tireur*, organization of resistance, 573
 - French army, unification of, 576
 - German war crimes, inter-Allied declaration, 7
 - inter-Allied war effort, participation in, 575
 - Liberation Française*, organization of resistance, 573
 - military campaign in North Africa, 575
 - Munich Agreement, rejection of, 574

Free French National Committee — *Continued*

- North African situation, communiqué of Nov 16, 1942 on, 575
- organizations of French internal resistance, 573-5
- reciprocal-aid agreement with U.S., 10, 565
- republican legitimacy, 576
- sovereignty of French people, respect for, 573
- Syria and Lebanon:
 - independence of, 566
 - treaty of guaranty, negotiation of, 566
- Vichy collaborationists, debarment from unification of France, 576
- Vichy *coup d'état*, 576
- war for liberation, support of, 576
- French National Committee. *See* Free French National Committee.

G

- Gandhi, Mohandas K., 283, 296, 299
- George II, King of Greece:
 - address to U.S. Congress on international understanding, 539-40
 - freedom from want, 540-1
 - message to Greeks in U.S., 538-9
 - message to U.S. on Greek fight for justice, truth and liberty, 531
 - peace, Greek contribution toward, 540
 - reorganization of international economic life, 539-40
 - resistance to end, 532
- George VI, King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, etc.:
 - force, destruction of principle of, 157
 - India, message to, 280
 - Nazi goal of world conquest, 184
 - peace proposal of Queen of the Netherlands and the King of the Belgians, reply to, 166
 - spirit of brotherhood, 277
- Gerbrandy, Pieter S.:
 - Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941
 - speech on resolution of solidarity in war and collaboration in peace, 507-8
 - justice for murder of Netherlands patriots, 515-16

subjugated peoples, effort to break down Hitlerism, 508

Germany:

- British Labor Party, attitude toward, 674
- disarmament of, 209, 430, 433, 504
- equality of opportunity in trade, 209, 234
- federation, European, place in, 410
- freedom and equity for, 316
- "German Peace," 418
- Jews, policy of exterminating, declaration by certain countries condemning, 14
- lessons to be learned, 432-3
- Nazism, poison of, 484
- occupation of, 433, 495
- Poles, extermination of, 484
- political education of, 433, 484
- position in post-war Europe, 432-3
- quarantine of, 485
- re-education of, 484
- regeneration of people of, 433
- revolutionary change in thinking of, 433
- Roman Catholic leaders, cooperation with, in post-war period, 646
- supervision of, in post-war period, 477-8
- territories conquered, evacuation of, 418
- treatment as enemy state:
 - Beneš proposals, 432-3
 - frontiers of 1938, return to, 416
 - hatred of German people by other nations, 544
 - post-war period, 544-5, 674
 - Prussia, division of, 416
 - quarantine method, 416, 485
- United Kingdom statement on Czechoslovak frontiers, 436-7
- war crimes, punishment of:
 - Czechoslovak demands for, 436, 441
 - declaration by 9 occupied countries, Jan. 13, 1942, 7
 - Netherlands assistance in, 516
 - Polish Govt., decree of, 480
 - statements by Franklin D. Roosevelt, 109, 114
 - youth of, 200, 423-5
- Good Neighbor policy, 19, 24, 608
- Government of India Act, 1935, 278, 280

Greece, 530-47:
 armed forces, agreement with United Kingdom on, 538
 Balkan Entente, 544
 Balkan Union, agreement with Yugoslavia on, 535-8
 statement of Anthony Eden, 226
 Bulgaria, relations with, 534
 chronology, 530
 economic post-war policies, joint statement of King George II and Pres. Roosevelt on, 541-2
 George II, message to Greeks in U.S., 538-9
 German war crimes, declaration, 7
 Jews, declaration condemning German policy of exterminating, 14
 joint declaration on post-war reconstruction at I.L.O. Conference, 414-5
 Joint Declaration, with Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Jan 14, 1942, 8
 lend-lease agreement with U.S., 10, 542
 liberation of, 531, 538
 maritime power of, 546
 pledge of Pres. Roosevelt to restore self-government, 67
 population exchange with Turkey, 533
 Soviet Russian influence, post-war, in, 545
 United Kingdom, agreement on Greek armed forces, 538
 United Nations, Joint Declaration by, 1
 Greek-Yugoslav Pact for Balkan Union, 535-8, 544-5
 Greenwood, Arthur, relief, planning for, 222
 Grew, Joseph C.:
 Axis finance vs. Allied finance, 127
 Japanese militarism, total defeat of, 137
 objectives in Far Eastern war, 121
 role of Japan in post-war world, 129
 Grigg, Sir Edward, statement on a Christian peace, 166
 Guan, Alberto:
 hemisphere defense, 607
 Nazism, repudiation of, 607
 Guardia, Rafael A. C., continental defense, 607
 Guatemala, Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 Gutt, Camille:
 Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept. 24, 1941,

economic needs of post-war Europe, resolution on, speech on adoption of, 526-7
 King Leopold, liberation of, 524
 territorial integrity and independence, restoration of, 524

H

Haakon VII, King of Norway:
 appeal to Norwegian people, 487
 broadcast to Norwegian people to continue resistance, 492
 independence of Norway, 486-7
 proclamations:
 constitution of Norway, loyalty of people to, 488-9
 liberty and independence, 487
 small nations, rights of, 488
 U.S.S.R., sympathy for attack on, 492
 Haiti, Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 Halifax, Lord:
 American industrial strength, value of, 196
 Christian civilization, preservation of, 180
 community of nations, 188
 German Govt. as obstacle to peace, 176
 international community, structure of, 197
 law, rule of, 165
 liberty and security, re-establishment of, 161
 prerequisites for peace conference, 170
 primary aim to win war, 164
 territorial adjustments, 190
 Hambro, Carl J., liberation, work of, 488
 Havana, Act of, 579
 Hinsley, His Eminence Arthur Cardinal, broadcast on peace, 639-40
 Honduras, Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 Hoover, Herbert:
 armistice, demand for no, 665
 boundaries, provisional settlement of, 665
 commercial treaties, restoration of, 666
 constitutional assemblies, election of, in enemy countries, 666
 disarmament of enemy states, 665
 economic blockade of enemy, removal of, when disarmament completed, 665

- Hoover, Herbert — *Continued*
 economic reconstruction, 650, 666
 food as foundation of peace, 650
 National War Council, necessity for, 650
 peace conference, elimination of, 665
 peace-making:
 commissions, appointment of, 666
 conditional peace, 665-7
 machinery for, 667
 preparation for, 650
 prisoners, repatriation of, 665
 Hostages, execution of, statements on:
 Churchill, Winston, 218
 Roosevelt, Franklin D., 53
 Hull, Cordell:
 Albania, restoration of freedom, 146
 American heritage, preservation and defense of, 26
 American sea power, importance of, 48
 Atlantic Charter, comment on, 45
 Canada, agreement with, on post-war economic settlements, 144
 economic internationalism, 85
 foreign policy, fundamental principles of, 19, 31, 34
 Jews, right of, to freedom and equality, 129
 letter from Netherlands Ambassador Loudon on lend-lease agreement, 513-14
 letter from Norwegian Ambassador Morgenstjerne on lend-lease agreement, 497-9
 Outline of Proposed Basis for Agreement between Japan and U S., 57
 self-determination, policy of, 147
 trade-agreements program, 23
 triumph of principles of humanity, 38
 United Nations Declaration, statement on, 66
 use of American resources to establish international currency, 49
 world economic reconstruction, program of, 39
 world organization, 99
 Human person, rights and dignity of, 420, 626, 631, 633
 Human rights, charter of, 420
 Hungary:
 re-education of, 434
 relation to Czechoslovak-Polish Confederation, 417
 Rumania, territorial dispute with, 190
 territorial aggrandizement, 434
 territory given by Germany, 417
 Hu Shih, Dr.
 durable peace, fight for, 378-9
 "League to Enforce Peace" plan, 396-7
 reasons for fighting Japan, 391
 United Nations task in post-war world, 396-7
 Hyde Park Declaration, 304
- I
- Iceland, cooperation of Norway with, 489
 Imperialism:
 British Labor Party, attitude toward, 675
 colonial, 657
 end of, 334, 590
 international, 649
 India, 278-300:
 British proposal as presented by Sir Stafford Cripps, text, 290
 Chiang K'ai-shek, message to people of, 388-90
 chronology, 279
 Constitution, new, 286, 288, 292, 299
 defense of, British control of, 294
 development toward self-government, 278
 Dominion status as goal of British Govt., 281-2, 284, 286, 288
 Govt. of India Act (1935), 278, 280
 importance in war effort, 288, 296
 minorities, protection of, 285, 289, 293
 United Nations, Joint Declaration by, 1
 War Advisory Council, establishment of, 285
 Inter-Allied Committee for Food and Raw Materials, 494
 Inter-Allied Meetings, London:
 Jun. 12, 1941:
 resolution on solidarity in war and collaboration in peace, text, 3
 speeches by —
 Belgian Prime Minister, 524-6
 Cassin, René, 567
 Churchill, Winston, 206
 Czechoslovak Minister for Foreign Affairs, 411
 Greek Minister to United Kingdom, 533

- Luxemburg Prime Minister, 501-2
- Netherlands Prime Minister, 507-8
- Norwegian Foreign Minister, 491
- Polish Prime Minister, 455-7
- Yugoslav Minister to United Kingdom, 548
- Sept 24, 1941:
 - Atlantic Charter, resolution on, text, 3
 - speeches by —
 - Cassin, René, 568-70
 - Greek Prime Minister, 534-5
 - Luxemburg Foreign Minister, 502-3
 - Yugoslav Foreign Minister, 548-9
- European post-war economic needs, resolution on, text, 4
- speeches by —
 - Belgian Minister of Finance, 526-7
 - Cassin, René, 570-1
 - Greek Prime Minister, 534-5
 - Luxemburg Foreign Minister, 503
 - Netherlands Foreign Minister, 511
 - Norwegian Minister of Supply, 493
 - Polish Minister of Finance, 463
 - Soviet Ambassador to United Kingdom, 358
 - Yugoslav Minister of Finance, 549-50
- statements of Eden, Anthony, 212, 217
- Inter-American Commission for Territorial Administration, 581
- Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, 582-3
- Inter-American Juridical Committee, preliminary recommendation, conclusions:
 - armaments, limitation of, 588
 - association of nations, new character of, 588
 - collective security system, 588
 - disputes, settlement by peaceful methods, 586
 - economic imperialism, elimination of, 590
 - economic nationalism, elimination of, 590
 - force, repudiation of use of, 586
 - international organization, more effective, 587
 - moral law, priority of, 586
 - political imperialism, abandonment of, 589
 - political nationalism, elimination of, 589
 - power, balance of, abandonment of, 588
 - solidarity in presence of aggression, 587
 - sovereignty, modification of, 587
 - war, elimination of social factors of, 591
- Inter-American solidarity, 24, 25, 34
- International court of justice
 - British Liberal Party, resolution on, 685-6
 - China's faith in, 393
 - statements by —
 - Eden, Anthony, 253
 - Simon, Viscount, 254
 - Wallace, Henry A., 149
 - Welles, Sumner, 142
- International currency, 49
- International Labor Office:
 - Conference, Oct. 27-Nov. 6, 1941:
 - joint declaration by the government, workers' and employers' delegates of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia on post-war reconstruction, 414-15
 - resolutions on:
 - emergency and reconstruction measures, 5
 - endorsement of Atlantic Charter, 6
 - war and peace, 7
 - speeches of:
 - Attlee, Clement R., 219
 - Roosevelt, Franklin D., 55
 - economic reconstruction problems, study of, 241
 - role in building post-war world, 229, 270
 - structure of, 628
- International law:
 - juridic order, rehabilitation of, 626
 - return to, in post-war period, 425
- International natural law, 611

International police force:

American Rabbits, suggestion of, 630
 basis of international organization, 361

British Liberal Party, resolution on, 685

China's demand for, 395

statements on.

Cranborne, Viscount, 238

Eden, Anthony, 233

Hu Shih, Dr., 397

Knox, Frank, 49

Lothian, Lord, 174, 195

Morrison, Herbert, 234

Stassen, Harold E., 664

Welles, Sumner, 88

Willkie, Wendell L., 651

International society, integration of, 541

Invasion, security against, 539

Iran:

British-Soviet troops, entry of, 209

Soviet attitude toward, 360

treaty with United Kingdom and U.S.S.R., 224

Iraq, adherence to Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1

Isolationism, abolition of, for world security, 403, 648-9

Italy:

basis for peace with, address of Adolf

A. Berle, Jr., 135

post-war position, 416-17

J

Japan:

aggression in Asia, 384-6

defeat of militarists, address of Joseph C. Grew, 137

"Greater East Asia," 384-5

Outline of Proposed Basis for Agreement with, 57

role in post-war world, outlined by Joseph C. Grew, 129

Jews:

Allied declaration condemning German policy of extermination, 14
 statement of Anthony Eden, 273

British Labor Party, 683

Four Freedoms, applicable to, 99

freedom under Atlantic Charter, statement by Cordell Hull, 129

mass murders in Poland, 484

non-discrimination against, in New Poland, 450, 471

Joint Declaration by United Nations, Jan 1, 1942, text, 1

Joint Economic Committees, Canada and U.S., 41

Jowitt, Sir William:

post-war trade and finance, 246

standard of living, improvement of, 266

Juridic order, rehabilitation of, 626

Justice, international court of. *See* International Court of Justice

K

Kleffens, Eelco N. van:

Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept. 24, 1941.

reservation on fourth point of Charter, question on, 509-10

resolution on Atlantic Charter, speech on, 509-10

relief of Netherlands in post-war plans, 511

Knox, Frank:

freedom of the seas, 49

maintenance of naval power, 127

preservation of freedom for all, 65

Koht, Halvdan, independence of Poland, 489

Korea, independence of, demand by China for, 400

Krnjevic, Juraj:

coordination of Serbs and Croats, 556

war criminals, punishment of, 556

L

Labor:

Pope Pius XII, statements of, 617, 619, 626

rights of, 46, 210, 662

standards, maintenance of, 220

Lang, Rev. Cosmo Gordon, Archbishop of Canterbury, broadcast on justice in peace settlement, 641

Lapointe, Ernest, freedom, preservation of, 305

League of Nations:

British Labor Party, support of, 668

China's attitude on, 393

collective security, failure to achieve, 505

- defects of, 528, 676
- failure of, reasons for, 42, 173, 344-5, 495
- good experiment, 630
- new organization, possibility of developing, 218, 495
- retention of part of machinery, 169
- revival of, 499
- Sino-Japanese conflict, failure in, 398-9
- supernational point of view, lack of, 505
- "League to Enforce Peace" in post-war world, 396-7, 403
- Lebanon:
 - declaration to people of, by Genl. Catroux, 567
 - independence of, 566
- Lebrun, Albert:
 - foundations of just and lasting peace, 562
 - peace proposal of Queen of the Netherlands and the King of the Belgians, reply to, 561
- Lehman, Herbert, food relief and supplies administration, 144, 664
- Leith-Ross, Sir Frederick, Inter-Allied Bureau for post-war food and raw material needs of Europe, 494
- Lend-lease aid.
 - Acheson, Dean, speech on, 97
 - Act, text, 34
 - Belgium, Jun 16, 1942, 529
 - China, Jun 2, 1942, 10, 392
 - Greece, Jul. 10, 1942, 10, 542
 - Netherlands, Jul 8, 1942, 10, 513
 - letter of Ambassador Loudon to Secy. Hull, 513-14
 - Norway, Jul. 11, 1942, 10, 497
 - letter from Norwegian Ambassador Morgenstierne to Secy. Hull, 497-9
 - Poland, Jul 1, 1942, 10, 478
 - United Kingdom, Feb. 23, 1942, 10
 - benefits received by U.S., 77
 - Yugoslavia, Jul. 24, 1942, 10, 556
 - keystone in national defense program, 48
 - nations receiving aid, list, 18
 - Netherlands contracts transferred to U.S. Govt., 513-14
 - post-war reconstruction, role in, 92, 97
- Liberal Party of Great Britain, resolution on international affairs, 684-6
- Lidice, destruction of, by Nazis, 436
- Lie, Trygve:
 - continental bloc, opposition to inclusion of Norway in, 490
 - cooperation with —
 - British Empire, 490
 - Greece, 490
 - Iceland, 489
 - U.S., 490
 - Western peoples, 489
 - disarmament of Germany, 495
 - economic future of Norway, 489
 - Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941, speech on resolution on collaboration of all free peoples, 491
 - international planned economy, 496
 - markets, importance of new, 496
 - military cooperation of Allied Powers, 495
 - military occupation of Germany, 495
 - political machinery in post-war period, 495
 - raw materials, access to, 496
 - summary of article on "When Peace Returns," 494-7
- Linhthgow, Lord:
 - India, constitutional development of, 280
 - new constitution for India, promise of, 286
 - plea to India for united war effort, 284
 - unity in India, failure to secure, 282, 300
- Litvinov, Maxim:
 - collaboration in post-war period, 361-2
 - durable peace, 363
 - Great Britain, friendship with, 362
 - Nazism, eradication of, 363
 - united efforts for peace, 363
 - U.S., friendship with, 362, 375-6
- Lothian, Lord:
 - Anglo-American power, peace based on, 195
 - equality of all nations before the law, 163
 - fight for security, 181
 - world organization, 172-3
- Loudon, Dr. A., mutual aid agreement with U.S., letter to Secy Hull, 513
- Lozovsky, Solomon A.:
 - Poland, independence of, 355
 - Soviet-Polish agreement, 355
- Luxemburg, 501-5:
 - chronology, 501

Luxemburg — *Continued*

- German war crimes, inter-Allied declaration, 7
- Jews, declaration condemning German policy of exterminating, 14
- Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1

M

- Machinery of international cooperation, strengthening of, 539
- Mackenzie King, W. L.:
 - Canadian-American cooperation, 311
 - Christian civilization, preservation of, 303, 307
 - defense of freedom, 304, 307
 - fear, elimination of, 308
 - Nazi aggression as cause of war, 302
 - new world order, meaning of, 305, 309
 - Ogdensburg Agreement, 29, 304
 - United Nations, common interests of, 312
 - war of hemispheres, 307
- Macmillan, W. M., statement on colonies, 244
- Madagascar, status, British statement on, 231
- Maisky, Ivan:
 - Atlantic Charter, speech on resolution, 356-7
 - economic reconstruction, post-war, in Europe, 358
- Malvern Conference, Church of England, conclusions of, 643
- Man, rights of, 420, 626, 631, 633
- Manchuria, conscription in, 394
- Mandate system:
 - abolition, in Syria and Lebanon, 566
 - application to African colonies, 632
- Markets:
 - access to, 517
 - opening up of new, 496
- Martin, Joseph W., Jr.:
 - domestic problems, solution of, 651
 - freedom, attainment of, 652
- Masaryk, Jan:
 - American aid in post-war reconstruction, 424-5
 - cooling-off period before permanent peace establishment, 423
 - cooperation with United Kingdom, 411
 - economic development of Europe, 415-16
 - economic self-sufficiency, 415
 - European federation, 415
 - exchange of letters with British Govt on Munich Agreement, 253, 435
 - Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun 12, 1941, speech at, 411
 - Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept. 24, 1941, resolution on Atlantic Charter, speech on, 412-13
 - Munich Agreement, exchange of letters with British Govt, 253, 435
 - punishment of German war crimes, 436
 - re-education of Europe, 424-5
 - small states of Europe, rights of, 423
- McEwen, John, 317
- Menzies, Robert Gordon:
 - battle for humanity, 318
 - collective security, 315
 - free world, aim of, 317-18
 - Germany, freedom and equity for, 316
 - repudiation of dishonorable peace, 317
- Messersmith, George S., American foreign policy (1939), 19
- Metaxas, Genl John.
 - Albania, liberation of, 531
 - fight for Balkan peoples, 531
 - freedom, struggle for, 532
 - Greece, liberation of, 531
 - human civilization, struggle for, 531, 532
 - Mediterranean position of Greece, 532
- Mexico, 592-602:
 - adherence to Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 - chronology, 592
- Michalopoulos, A.:
 - Atlantic Charter, support of, 543
 - Nazism, destruction of, 544
 - Slav neighbors, amity and understanding with, 545
- Migration of peoples, 620
- Military occupation of Germany, 433, 495
- Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American Republics:
 - Second Meeting, Havana, Jul. 21-30, 1940:
 - resolutions and recommendations, 578-81
 - Act of Havana on provisional administration of European

- colonies and possessions in the Americas, 579
 - maintenance of peace and union, 578-9
 - provisional administration of European colonies and possessions in the Americas, convention on, 579-81
 - Third Meeting, Rio de Janeiro, Jan 15-28, 1942.
 - resolutions on —
 - Atlantic Charter, 585
 - post-war problems, 584
 - strategic materials, production of, 582-4
 - Minorities:
 - cultural and linguistic, protection of, 427
 - Czechoslovak attitude on, 434, 438, 446
 - equality of rights in New Poland, 473
 - ethnic, 614
 - German, in Central Europe, 443-4
 - India, protection of, in *See under* India.
 - Polish, safeguarding of, 451
 - population-transfers, 428, 446
 - rights of, 427-8, 633
 - solution of problem of, 446
 - Molotov, V. M.:
 - Albania, attitude of Soviet Govt. toward, 376-7
 - Anglo-Soviet treaty, speech on, 365
 - visit to U.S., 374
 - war crimes of Axis Powers, 366-9
 - Montreux Convention, fidelity of United Kingdom to, 208
 - Mook, Hubertus J. van
 - message of Queen Wilhelmina delivered to *New York Herald Tribune* Forum, 517-20
 - Netherlands Indies:
 - credits, post-war, 516
 - export system, 517
 - foreign exchange control, re-establishment of, 516
 - industrial products, need for, 517
 - markets, access to, 517
 - resources of, 516
 - tariffs, effect of, 517
 - Morality, international:
 - establishment of, 430, 479
 - restoration of values, 434
 - Morgensterne, Wilhelm Munthe de:
 - lend-lease agreement between U.S. and Norway, letter to Secy. of State Hull, 497-9
 - summary of provisions, 498-9
 - Morrison, Herbert:
 - plan for permanent peace, 234
 - social control of production, 274
 - Munich Agreement
 - end of, 437
 - letter to Jan Masaryk by Anthony Eden denouncing, 253
 - letter to Msgr. Jan Šrámek, Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, by Genl. de Gaulle, 574
 - repudiation by United Kingdom of post-1938 frontiers of Czechoslovakia, 253, 410, 436-7
 - speech of Masaryk to Czechoslovak State Council on end of, 437
 - speech of Ripka on liquidation of, 438
 - Mutual aid agreements (*see also* Lend-lease agreements).
 - Anglo-Polish pact, 460
 - Soviet-Polish agreement, 361
- N
- Nash, Walter:
 - economic security for all, 327
 - imperialism, end of, 334-7
 - inclusion of Russia and China in post-war discussions, 337
 - urgency of formulating peace plans, 333
 - world organization for war and peace, 328-33
 - National Conference of Christians and Jews, statement, 634
 - National Executive Committee of British Labor Party. *See* British Labor Party.
 - National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations, Central Council of the, 679-80
 - Nationalism, increase of, 454
 - Natural law, foundation of peace, 612
 - Nazism, destruction of, statements on:
 - Churchill, Winston, 191, 193, 207
 - Eden, Anthony, 207
 - Pierlot, Hubert, Prime Minister of Belgium, 525
 - Netherlands, 505-23:
 - arrangements through Office of Lend-Lease Adm. on transfer of Nether-

Netherlands — *Continued*

- lands contracts to U.S. Govt., 513-14
- Atlantic Charter, adherence to principles of, 509
- chronology, 505-6
- declaration of Government to the People's Council, N.E.I., 511-12
- disloyal Netherlands, treatment of, 516
- German war crimes, inter-Allied declaration on, 7
- Jews, declaration condemning German policy of exterminating, 14
- Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
- lend-lease agreement with U.S., 10, 513
- letter of Ambassador Loudon to Secy Hull on, 513-14
- national law, application of, to Nazi collaborators, 513
- peace proposal, reply of King George VI, 166
- pledge of Pres. Roosevelt to restore self-government, 67
- relief measures, 213
- statement of Govt. on post-war reconstruction conference of representatives from all parts of Kingdom, 512-13
- Netherlands Indies:
 - conference on status of, 515
 - credits, post-war, 516
 - declaration of Netherlands Govt. to the People's Council, N.E.I., 511-12
 - democracy, development of, 514
 - export system, 517
 - foreign exchange control, re-establishment of, 516
 - industrial products, need for, 517
 - markets, access to, 517
 - native intelligentsia, cooperation with Netherlands, 518
 - native population, education of, 515
 - post-war reconstruction conference of representatives from all parts of Kingdom, 512-13
 - resources of, 516
 - tariffs, effect of, 517
- Neutrality:
 - fallacy of, 505
 - policy of, 494
- New Zealand, 326-40:
 - chronology, 326
 - Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1

- reciprocal-aid agreement, with U.S., 10
- resolution of House of Representatives affirming devotion to cause of freedom, 327
- Nicaragua, Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
- Nine-Power Pact, 399
- Noel-Baker, P., shipping industry, future of, 227
- Nordic defensive bloc, pre-war, abandonment of idea by Norwegian Government, 499
- North Africa, campaign of Allied troops in, 575
- Norway, 486-500.
 - Atlantic Charter:
 - approval of, 495
 - resolution of Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept. 24, 1941, acceptance of, 492-3
 - "bridge between Atlantic powers and U.S.S.R.," 499
 - chronology, 486
 - churches, heroic resistance of, 646
 - cooperation with British Empire and U.S., 494
 - economic cooperation, post-war, statement on, 493
 - Finland, relation to, 492
 - freedom from fear and want, 493
 - German war crimes, inter-Allied declaration on, 7
 - Germany, war with, 492
 - Iceland, cooperation with, 489
 - Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941:
 - speech of Foreign Minister Lie on resolution, 491
 - Jews, declaration condemning German policy of exterminating, 14
 - Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 - League of Nations, revival of, 499
 - lend-lease agreement with U.S., 10, 497-9
 - merchant fleet, contribution to war effort, 498
 - Nasjonal Samling, punishment of, 500
 - occupation of, 486, 497
 - peace aims, statement of, by Govt. of, 499
 - pledge of Pres. Roosevelt to restore self-government, 67
 - quislings, punishment of, 500
 - resources of, 496

- restoration of freedom, statement by Churchill, Winston, 202
 - shipping in post-war period, 496
 - United Kingdom:
 - agreement with, for liberation from German domination, and employment of Norwegian armed forces, 490-1
 - United Nations basis of international cooperation, 495
 - U S., mutual aid agreement with, 497
 - Nygaardsvold, Johan:
 - administrative authority in hands of Norwegian people after war, 500
 - appeal to Norwegian people, 487
 - Atlantic Charter, acceptance of, 493
 - German people responsible for crimes committed in Norway, 500
 - independence of Norway, 486-7
 - law and order in transition period, maintenance of, 500
 - proclamations:
 - constitution of Norway, loyalty of people to, 488-9
 - liberty and independence, 486
 - production, means of, replacement of, 499
 - rebuilding of Norway, 499-500
- O
- Occupied countries:
 - declaration on German war crimes, Jan 13, 1942, 7
 - pledge of Pres. Roosevelt to restore self-government to, 67
 - Ogdensburg Agreement, 29, 42, 304
- P
- Paderewski, Ignace Jan, statement on democratic principles in New Poland, 451
 - Padilla, Ezequiel
 - Aryan race, condemnation of Nazi doctrine on, 593
 - continental solidarity, 593-4
 - Declaration by United Nations, letter to Secy. Hull on adherence to, 598
 - defense of hemisphere, 595
 - democracy, value of, 594, 596
 - future of the Americas, construction of, 596
 - peace, mission of Americas to build, 596
 - sovereignty and peace, 600-1
 - U.S. policies, aid in cementing Pan American confidence, 593
 - unity and friendship in Americas, 594
 - Panama:
 - cooperation with U.S., proclamation on, 605
 - Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 - Pan American Union, 585
 - Pan Americanism, doctrine of, 593
 - Pan-Europe plan, 417
 - Pan-Germanism, liquidation of, 442-3
 - Parliament of nations, 630
 - Parsons, Rev. Wilfrid, bill of rights, international, 633
 - Pasvolsky, Leo:
 - foundations of economic peace, 71
 - raw materials, equal access to, 75
 - relief measures, 73, 76
 - Peace proposal of Queen of the Netherlands and the King of the Belgians, reply of President of France to, 561
 - Peace settlement.
 - permanent system. *See* World organization.
 - preparation for, 431
 - transitional period:
 - cooling-off period, 423
 - demobilization and re-employment, 629
 - famine and pestilence, problems of, 629
 - Hoover statement on, 665-7
 - international secretariat, provisional, 629
 - maintenance of American naval power during, 128-9
 - pooling of resources, 204-5
 - relief and reconstruction, 96, 124, 257
 - United Nations cooperation in, 102
 - Peaceful change in international organization, 627
 - Peoples, movement of *See* Populations, exchange and transfer of.
 - Perkins, Milo, transition from war to peace economy, 86
 - Peru:
 - adherence to principles of Atlantic Charter, 1
 - democratic principles, defense of, 608
 - just peace, 607-8

- Peru — *Continued*
 outlawry of Nazism, 607-8
- Pétain, Marshal Henri Philippe, mes-
 sage of Pres Roosevelt to, 131
- Peter II, King of Yugoslavia:
 address before U.S. Congress, 554-5
 Atlantic Charter, acceptance of, 555
 Axis aggression, fight against, 554-5
 Balkan Union, 553
 Czechoslovakia, relations with, 553
 education of orphans of victims of
 war, 554
 foreign affairs, independence of state
 in, 554
 foreign policy of Yugoslavia, 552
 freedom for Fatherland, 554
 joint statement with Roosevelt on
 prosecution of war, 555-6
 unification of country, 552
- Philip, André:
 army, navy, colonies and civil adminis-
 trations, responsibilities to French
 nation, 576
 collaboration of French resistance, 575
 French army, unification of, 576
- Philippines, Commonwealth of the,
 557-9:
 adherence to Joint Declaration by
 United Nations, 1
 chronology, 557
 Quezon, Manuel L. *See that title.*
- Pierlot, Hubert:
 collective security, cooperation in,
 525-6
 common interests with Great Britain,
 525
 disarmament, comparative, 529
 economic entente, 530
 German invasion of Belgium, 525
 German war crimes, punishment of,
 527-8
 Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941,
 speech on adoption of resolution on
 solidarity in war and collaboration
 in peace, 524-6
 Nazism, destruction of, 525
 peace with independence and honor,
 524
 sanctions, application of, 527
 war, abolition of, 529
- Poland, 446-85:
 Anglo-Soviet treaty of May 26, 1942,
 importance to, 476-8
 army in territory of U.S.S.R., 354, 471
 Atlantic Charter, acceptance of prin-
 ciples in resolution of Inter-Allied
 Meeting, Sept 24, 1941, 461-3
 belligerency, 449
 British cooperation in war, 460
 British declaration on non-recognition
 of territorial changes since Aug
 1939, 460
 broadcast to people of, by Govern-
 ment-in-Exile, 451
 chronology, 446-8
 collaboration with British Empire
 and U.S., 462-3
 Czechoslovakia:
 confederation, agreement for, Jan.
 23, 1942, 467-9
 joint communiqué, 435-6
 joint declaration, Nov 11, 1940,
 452-3
 statement by Stronski on, 453-4
 joint declaration, Sept 24, 1941,
 accepting Atlantic Charter as
 basis of new European order,
 464-5
 declaration of principles for future
 work for, 471-4
 democratic principles for foundation
 of new state, 450, 451
 dictatorship, condemnation of, 451
 dignity of man, 453
 eastern frontiers, 474
 extermination of people by Germany,
 484
 freedom of assembly, 473
 freedom of association, 473
 frontiers:
 Conference of Ambassadors, deci-
 sion of (1923), 460
 population-transfers across, 481
 security of country as part of Eu-
 ropean security, 462, 482
 violation of, by U S S R , 460-1
 German-Soviet treaty, communiqué of
 Polish Legation in Berne, 449
 German war crimes, punishment of.
 decree, 480
 joint declaration with Czechoslo-
 vakia, Greece, Poland, Yugo-
 slavia, 7
 Germany, occupation of, in post-war
 period, 483
 Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941,
 speech of Sikorski on resolution,
 455-7

- Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept 24, 1941
 - Europe, post-war economic needs of, resolution accepted by Strasburger, 463-4
- Jews, declaration condemning German policy of exterminating, 14
- Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
- joint declaration on post-war reconstruction at I.L.O. Conference, 414-15
- Joint Declaration with Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia, Jan 14, 1942, 8
- lend-lease agreement with U.S., 10, 478
- liberation of:
 - Churchill, Winston, 201
 - Eden, Anthony, 207
- minorities, safeguarding of, 451
- Norwegian Foreign Minister's broadcast to Polish people, 489
- partition by U.S.S.R. and Germany (1939), 460
- pledge of Pres. Roosevelt to restore self-government, 67
- Polish National Council, 470, 476
- population-transfers, 481
- prisoners of war in U.S.S.R., 458
- remedial measures against recurrence of war, 462
- rights, reservation of, 449-50
- seaboard, expansion of, 450, 451, 462, 485
- securities, public, value of, 450
- Slav states, solidarity of, 451
- unilateral settlement of war problems, repudiation of, 449
- U.S.S.R.:
 - amnesty granted to Polish citizens by, 355
 - joint declaration of friendship and mutual aid, 361
 - non-aggression agreement, 354
 - first anniversary of, 479
 - treaty of Riga (1920), 474
- United Kingdom:
 - non-recognition of territorial changes since Aug 1939, 460
 - treaty of alliance with, 447, 449
- U.S.:
 - mutual aid agreement with, 478
- Police, international. *See* International police force.
- Polish-Czechoslovak Confederation:
 - democratic order in Europe, basis of, 420-1
 - joint communiqué on, 435-6
 - membership, expansion of, 427
- Polish-Czechoslovak Coordination Committee:
 - meeting, 420
 - mixed commissions: economic, military, social and cultural, 435-6
- Polish-Czechoslovak union, 408
- Polish-Danubian federation, 408
- Polish National Council, resolution on Central European federation, 476
- Political equality of states, Beneš statement on, 429
- Political parties:
 - Great Britain, 668-86
 - U.S., 647-67
- Pope Pius XII (*see also* Vatican, The):
 - armaments, liberation from slavery of, 613, 622, 623
 - charity, universal law of, 610
 - deficiencies of past, correction of, 613
 - disarmament, fundamental importance of, 613, 623
 - Divine Law, principles of, 614
 - divine precepts of life, 615
 - economic development of states, 622
 - equity, reciprocal, 613
 - European order, 614, 615
 - faith and morals, principles of, 616
 - family, 617, 620-1, 624-5, 626
 - Five Points for Just Peace, 613-14
 - force, abuse of, 613
 - goods, distribution of, 618
 - human person, rights and dignity of, 618, 626
 - impartiality of Church in relation to political systems, 616
 - imprescriptible moral and juridical rights, 616
 - independence of all nations, 613
 - international community life, re-ordering of, 613
 - juridic order, rehabilitation of, 626
 - juridical institutions, establishment of, 613
 - justice and equity, 614, 615
 - labor, 617, 619
 - beneficial interference of State in field of, 619
 - dignity and prerogatives of, 626

- Pope Pius XII. labor — *Continued*
 organization of, 619
 State, responsibility of, to provide employment, 619
 mankind, re-education of, 612
 marry, right to, 619
 material goods, use of, 617, 618
 migration of peoples, 620
 minorities, ethnical, 614
 morality of peace, 615
 national harmony, 626
 natural law, 611
 New Order, prerequisites of:
 economy, for proper standard of living, 616
 egoism, triumph over, 616
 hate, triumph over, 616
 juridical and economic solidarity, 616
 mistrust, triumph over, 616
 utilitarianism, triumph over, 616
 offer from Pres. Roosevelt to send personal representative, 21
 order, necessity for living together in, 626
 poverty, 618
 principles of justice and equity, 614, 615
 property, private, 619-20
 religion, freedom of, 623
 religious and moral aspects of peace, 621
 security of states, 621
 small states, rights of, 622
 social unity, defense of, 627
 state, conception of, according to Christian spirit, 626
 state, function of, in modern world, 610-12
 tranquility, living together in, 626
 treaties:
 modification of, 612, 614
 respect for, 623
 universal love, 614
 war, abolition of, 622-4, 626
 worship of God, 619
 Populations, exchange and transfer of, 428, 446, 481, 533
 Portugal, Anglo-American policy toward, 264
 Prado, Manuel:
 democratic principles, defense of, 608
 just peace, 607-8
 outlawry of Nazism, 607-8
 Pan American crusade, faith in, 608
 President of the U.S. *See* Roosevelt, Franklin D.
 Prisoners of war:
 Polish, in U.S.S.R., 458
 repatriation of, 665
 transfer of, 481
 Property, non-recognition of the transference of, declaration of Czechoslovak Govt on, 421
- Q
- Quezon, Manuel L.
 Atlantic Charter
 application to whole world, 558
 misunderstanding of name of, 558
 contribution of Philippines to peace in Pacific, 559
 Declaration by United Nations, adherence to, 557
 Filipino civilization, merger of East and West in, 559
 Rizal Day, celebration of, 558
 Quislings, punishment of, 500
- R
- Rabbis, American, Central Conference of, program for world reconstruction, 630
 Racial equality.
 Chinese demand for, 400
 National Conference of Christians and Jews, statement on, 634
 need of world society to fit requirements of all races, 395
 Netherlands, Kingdom of, policy of, 522
 Polish pledge of, 454
 Willkie statement on, 647
 Raczkiewicz, Wladyslaw:
 confederation, necessity for, 480
 cooperation with Allies, 479
 peace, guaranteed, 451
 Polish National Council, purpose of, 470
 reciprocal rights of development, 452
 state, integrity of, 470, 479
 Raczyński, Count Edward:
 Atlantic Charter, resolution on, 461
 disarmament of aggressors, 462
 freedom, struggle for, 448

- Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept. 24, 1941,
speech at, 461-3
retribution for Poland's wrongs, 461
sea, access to, 462
United Kingdom, cooperation with, 461
- Raw materials
equal access to, statements on:
Hull, Cordell, 39, 58
Lie, Trygve, 496
Pasvolsky, Leo, 75
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 56
Welles, Sumner, 43, 114
production and distribution of, regula-
tions on, 251
shipment of, 481
- Reciprocal-aid lend-lease agreements, 10
(*see also* Lend-lease aid)
- Reconstruction measures *See* Economic
policies: reconstruction.
- Red Army
liberation of Soviet soil, 362-3
military power of, 364
- Refugees, political, 481
- Refugees, war, transfer in post-war
period, 481
- Regional confederation essential to world
commonwealth, 429
- Regionalism
Chinese opposition to, 403
councils, 330-1
value in international affairs, 149
- Relief measures:
American participation in, 44, 216
appointment of Herbert H. Lehman as
Director of Foreign Relief and Re-
habilitation Operations, 144, 664
coordination of plans, 239, 258
food as foundation of peace, 650
statements on:
Attlee, Clement R., 219
Cranborne, Viscount, 272
Eden, Anthony, 212, 217, 248, 257
Greenwood, Arthur, 222
Pasvolsky, Leo, 73, 76
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 147
Welles, Sumner, 141
wheat, distribution of, 13, 248
world-wide problem, 268
- Reparations, abolition of, 195, 627
- Republican National Committee, resolu-
tions on victory in war and coopera-
tion in post-war world, 649, 660
- Rerum Novarum* of Pope Leo XIII,
encyclical, 617
- Reserve stocks, role in reconstruction, 213
- Resolutions, United Nations, 1-14
- Reynaud, Paul.
economic policy, sane, 562
French way of life, 562
"phoney" war, denial of, 562
- Rights of man, individual, 633
- Rio Conference. *See* Ministers of For-
eign Affairs of the American Repub-
lics, Third Meeting
- Ripka, Hubert:
Central European federation, 407
Czechoslovak-Polish declaration, 407
Danubian federation, 407
European federation, 408
Munich Agreement, liquidation of, 438
Polish-Baltic federation, 408
small states, 408
- Roman Catholic Church *See* Vatican,
The
- Roosevelt, Franklin D.:
American aid to countries resisting
aggression, 30, 41, 47
American interest in permanent peace,
18
appeal to French people, 130
Arab peoples, appreciation of coopera-
tion of, 144
arsenal of democracy, 47
Atlantic Charter:
first anniversary message to Prime
Minister Churchill, 108
message to Congress, 45
statement on, 44
text, 2
basic principles of international rela-
tions, 63
cooperation and development of Phil-
ippine Govt., 138
costs of war, allocation of, among
United Nations, 93
destruction of Hitlerism, 54
doctrine of freedom of the seas, 40, 47,
53, 54
equality of man, war to uphold doc-
trine of, 66
Four Freedoms, 33, 93
German war crimes, punishment of,
109, 114
good-neighbor policy, 24
hostages, execution of, 53
Inter-American solidarity, 25, 40
Jews, applicability of Four Freedoms
to, 99

- Roosevelt, Franklin D. — *Continued*
 joint statement with King George II
 of Greece on collaboration in economic post-war policies, 541-2
 lend-lease as basis for world-wide economic system, 68, 92
 letter to Pope Pius XII, 20
 liberal economic policies, promotion of, 26
 liberation of France, 131
 maintenance of American liberties, 26
 moral basis for peace, 24
 Ogdensburg Agreement, 29
 pledge to occupied countries, 67
 pledge to people of Philippines, 65
 preservation of American civilization, 18, 64
 relief, planning for, 147
 self-determination, policy of, 22
 social objectives, 55
 Survival War, 79
 Trade Agreement Act, extension of, 22
 United Nations as basis of world organization, 91
 war for security, 61
 youth, role of, in post-war world, 110
- Rumania.
 relation to Czechoslovak-Polish Confederation, 417
 territorial disputes with Bulgaria and Hungary, 190
- Russia. *See* U S S R
- S
- Sanctions, application of, to aggressors, 527-8
- Santos, Eduardo, responsibilities of Colombia for Pan American solidarity, 606
- Savage, Michael J., support of Britain, 326
- Scandinavian bloc, 418
- Sea power:
 control of, as factor in maintaining peace, 174
 importance of, 48, 49
- Seas, freedom of. *See* Freedom of the seas.
- Self-determination, policy of, statements on:
 Hull, Cordell, 147
 Roosevelt, Franklin D., 22
- Settlement of disputes by third-party judgment, 627
- Shipping
 future of industry, 227
 Norwegian contribution in post-war era, 493
 pooling of resources, 214
- Sikorski, Wladyslaw
 agricultural reforms, 473
 Anglo-Soviet treaty, speech on, 476-8
 Atlantic Charter, acceptance of, 475
 Baltic ports, importance of, 466
 boundaries, settlement of, 474
 British Commonwealth of Nations, model for international organization, 452
 British people, tribute to, 456
 Central European federation, 475
 Christian spirit, basis of new Poland, 452, 472
 Communism, attitude toward, 460
 confederation, idea of, 485
 confederation of Central and Eastern Europe, 483
 cooperation with Great Britain, 466
 criticism of government, 471
 Czechoslovakia, post-war collaboration with Poland, 482, 484
 Declaration by United Nations, acceptance of, 475
 "declaration for humanity and the nations," 456
 democratic republican state, 472, 483
 disarmament of aggressors, 472, 484
 durable peace, 452
 East Prussia, 483
 economic policy, national, 473
 economic security in Europe, 455
 equality of citizens before law, 467
 establishment of government in London, 452
 executive power, strong and efficient, 473
 federation of peoples, 467
 freedom of assembly, 473
 frontiers, inviolability of, 485
 Germanism, elimination of, 485
 Germans, atrocities committed by, 484
 Germany. occupation of, by Poland, in post-war period, 483
 punishment of, 472
 quarantine of, 484-5
 re-education of, 484

- Hitlerism, war against, 484
- independence, fight for national, 460, 482
- Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941, speech on resolution of, 455-7
- Jews:
 - mass murders of, by Germany, 484
 - non-discrimination against, in New Poland, 450, 471
- land, distribution of, 473
- living, standard of, raising of, 483
- markets in Europe, post-war, 459
- mistakes of past, 465
- New Order in free Europe, 457
- particularism, banning of, 467
- partition, non-recognition of, Soviet, 450
- partition of Poland, possibility in post-war period, 483
- policy of Polish Govt., 476-8, 482
- Polish army in U S S R., 471
- Polish-Czechoslovak Agreement, 454, 460, 470
- Polish-Czechoslovak declaration, interview on anniversary of signature, 465-6
- Polish Govt. declaration of principles for future work, 471-4
- Polish-Soviet Agreement, 458, 470-1, 476-8, 485
- Polish-Soviet declaration, radio address from Moscow on, 466-7
- Polish-Soviet treaty, address on first anniversary of, 479
- political parties, freedom for, 452
- political security for Europe, 455
- principles for New Poland, 472-4
- racial equality, 454
- rebuilding of free Poland, 452
- reconstitution of Polish state, 450, 472
- resolution of Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941, speech on, 455-7
- sea, broader access to, 472, 485
- small nations, rights of, 476
- sovereign rights, relinquishment of, 455
- territorial aims of Poland, 482
- territorial understanding with U S S R., 482
- totalitarian governments, repudiation of, 472
- U S., friendship with Poland, 457
- U.S. Govt. as model for European federation, 475
- U S S R., relations with Poland, 458, 470-1, 476-8, 485
- Versailles system, weakness of, 454
- visits to U.S., 474, 475, 482
- war crimes, punishment of, 472
- Western civilization, war for, 485
- work, right to, 473
- Simon, Viscount:
 - international court of justice, 254
 - war crimes, punishment of, 260
- Sinclair, Sir Archibald, statement on purpose of war, 669
- Slovakia, creation of, by Germany, 427
- Small states of Europe:
 - Beneš proposals on post-war position of, 406, 425-30
 - cooperation of, 546
 - need for collaboration among, statement by Churchill, 259
 - pattern for achieving independence, address by Pres. Roosevelt, 138
 - rights of, 57, 423, 476, 504, 540, 562, 622, 633
 - role in European organization, 182
 - statement of King Haakon VII of Norway, 488
- Smuts, Jan Christian.
 - African continent, liberation of, 343
 - colonies, future of, 349
 - destruction of Nazi system, 340
 - France, liberation of, 346
 - freedom, defense of, 342-3
 - India, emancipation of, 348
 - Nazi vs. free Europe, 341
 - Pan African development, 341
 - religious war, 346
 - world organization, 343-8
- Social justice, 542, 630
- Soong, T. V.:
 - collective security, machinery for, 398-9
 - general objectives for fighting Japan, 392-3
- South Africa, Union of. *See* Union of South Africa
- Soviet Union. *See* U S S R.
- Spaak, Paul-Henri.
 - confederations in Europe, 528
 - international organization, necessity for, 528
 - League of Nations, remedy for defects of, 528
 - monarchy in Belgium, 529
 - rebuilding of Belgium, 529

- Spaak, Paul-Henri — *(continued)*
 tariff barriers, 528
 unanimity rule of League of Nations,
 abolition of, 528
- Spain
 Anglo-American policy toward, 264
 status in post-war plans, 418
- Šrámek, Mgr. Jan
 letter from Genl. de Gaulle on Munich
 Agreement, 574
 letter to Genl. de Gaulle in support of
 Fighting France, 438
- Stalin, Joseph
 alliance of Soviet Union with U.S.
 and Great Britain, 364, 371-4
 extermination of German fascists, 364
 German people, extermination of,
 362-3
 October revolution anniversary 1941,
 358-61, 371-4
 struggle for freedom from Nazism, 364
 united front of peoples, 352-3
- Standard of living, need to raise, 86,
 106, 230-1, 247, 251, 266, 329
- Stassen, Harold E..
 airways commission, international, 664
 Axis nations, establishment of tem-
 porary governments in, 663
 Court of United Nations, establish-
 ment of, 664
 disarmament of Axis Powers, 663
 food relief and rehabilitation of devas-
 tated areas, 664
 free enterprise in post-war world, 662
 government, science of, 661
 home-front problems, 661
 isolationism, repudiation of, 663
 literacy of peoples, increase of, 664
 profit system, 661
 radio control, international, 664
 rights of business and labor, 662
 seas, international administration of
 gateways to, 664
 Security Exchange Law, modification
 of, 662
 United Nations government, bases of,
 663
 United Nations of world, membership
 in, 664-5
 war criminals, punishment of, 664
 world police force, 664
 world trade organization, 664
- State:
 autonomous will of, 611
 function of, in modern world, 610-12
 security for, 540-1
- Stewart, Sir Frederick, principles of
 lasting peace, 319
- Stiasubger, Henryk
 cooperation with other countries,
 463-4
 frontiers, establishment of Polish, 481
 Inter-Allied Meeting, Sept. 24, 1941,
 speech on resolution on European
 economic needs, 463-4
 population-transfers, 481
 production, pooling of, 463
 raw materials, shipment of, 481
- Strategic materials, production of.
 resolution of Third Meeting of Minis-
 ters of Foreign Affairs of the Ameri-
 can Republics, 582-4
- Stronski, Stanislaw:
 frontiers of Poland, 460-1, 474
 Polish-Czechoslovak Declaration, Nov
 11, 1940, 453-4
 treaty of Riga, celebration of 21st
 anniversary of, 474
- Subotitch, Ivan.
 Inter-Allied Meeting, Jun. 12, 1941,
 resolution on solidarity in war and
 collaboration in peace, acceptance
 of, 548
- Sudeten Germans
 attitude toward Czechoslovaks, 438-9
 collaboration of Czechoslovaks with
 loyal, 443
 treatment by Czechoslovakia in post-
 war period, 443-4
- Sun Yat-sen, Dr.
 equality of status for China, 401
 racial equality, 395
 universal brotherhood, concept of, 403
- Sunde, Arne, post-war economic needs
 of Europe, 493
- Surinam:
 conference on post-war position, 512-13
 constitution of, 512
- Šutej, Juraj, post-war European eco-
 nomic needs, resolution of Inter-
 Allied Meeting on, 549-50
- Syria:
 British promise of, 211
 declaration of Genl. Catroux to, 567
 independence granted by French Na-
 tional Committee, 566
 treaty of guaranty, negotiation of,
 567

T

- Tambacopoulos, A., independence of Greece, 531
- Tariffs, lowering of, 458, 627
- Temple, Most Rev. William, Archbishop of York, Malvern conference conclusions, 643
- Territorial Administration, Inter-American Commission for, 581
- Territorial integrity, principle of, 57, 524
- Territorial questions, European, Czechoslovak attitude on, 444
- Three People's Principles, 401
- Tixier, Adrien:
 - Free French aspirations, 573
 - organizations of French internal resistance:
 - aims of, 573-4
 - coordination of, 573
 - Genl de Gaulle chosen Chief of, 574
 - Vichy totalitarian policy, rejection of, 573
- Trade:
 - Germany, extension of principle of equality of opportunity to, 209, 234
 - international system, 541
 - liberal policies as basis for durable peace, 22, 23, 26, 29, 34, 39, 51, 72, 85, 92, 98, 105, 116, 125
 - most-favored-nation principle, 177
 - wheat, post-war distribution of, 13
- Trade Agreements Act, 22
- Trade unionism, 46, 210
- Transition period *See under* Peace settlement.
- Transport problems:
 - land transport facilities in Europe, 481
 - movement of peoples, 481
 - raw materials, shipment of, 481
- Treaties.
 - Anglo-Polish treaty of alliance, Aug. 25, 1939, 447, 449
 - Franco-Polish agreements, 1921 and 1928, 449
 - Franco-Polish protocol, Sept. 4, 1939, 449
 - German-Soviet, Sept. 29, 1939, 449
 - Iran-United Kingdom and U.S.S.R., 224
 - modification of, 612
 - Poland-U.S.S.R., 1920, 474
 - Poland-U.S.S.R., Jul 30, 1941, 479, 485

- U.S.S.R.-United Kingdom and Iran, 224
- United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., and Iran, text, 224
- United Kingdom-U.S.S.R., May 26, 1942, 235, 476
- Tripartite Pact (Japan, Germany and Italy), 379, 384
- Tsouderos, Emmanuel J.:
 - Albanian independence, 546
 - Atlantic Charter, 534-5
 - ethical principles in post-war world, 543
 - European economic needs, approval of resolution on, at Inter-Allied Meeting, 534-5
 - Greece, liberation of, 533
- Turkey.
 - British-Soviet declaration, 208
 - Greece, relations with, 533
 - population exchange with Greece, 533
- Tyranny, destruction of, 630

U

- Unemployment, international significance of, 459, 628
- Unequal treaties *See* Extraterritorial rights.
- Unilateral settlement of war problems, repudiation of, 449
- Union of South Africa, 340-50
 - chronology, 340
 - Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 - severance of relations with Vichy France, note of Jan Christian Smuts, 346
- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 351-77 (*see also subject headings and individuals*).
 - agreement with United Kingdom, 208
 - aid from Britain, promise of, 207
 - Albania, attitude toward, 376-7
 - alliance with United Kingdom, Australian reaction to, 320
 - alliance with U.S. and Great Britain, 371-4
 - amnesty to Polish citizens on Soviet territory, 355
 - Atlantic Charter, acceptance of principles of, 356-7
 - chronology, 351-2
 - claims for share in control of world problems, 545

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics —
Continued

collaboration in post-war period, 337,
361-2, 545

Czechoslovak military units in, 353

Czechoslovak plea for assistance to,
413

Czechoslovakia, friendly relations
with, 440

democratic aims, address of Henry
A. Wallace, 132

diplomatic relations with Poland re-
stored, 354

durable peace, 363

economic assistance from United King-
dom in post-war period, 365

economic reconstruction, post-war, 357
economic resources of world, allocat-
ion of, 357

Europe, post-war economic needs of,
resolution on, 358

European organization, cooperation
in, 417

European Russia, political relation
to Europe, 418

fascism, coalition against, 360-1

foreign policies, definition of, 356-7

friendship with U S and Great Britain,
362

German-Soviet treaty, communiqué
of Polish Legation at Berne, 449

Hitlerism, defeat of, 357, 363, 364,
374-5

Inter-Alled Meeting, Sept 24, 1941,
resolution on European post-war
economic needs, 358

internal affairs of other nations, non-
interference with, 360-1

Jews, declaration condemning German
policy of exterminating, 14

Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1

lend-lease agreement with U S., 10, 366

liberation of peoples from tyranny,
360-1

liberation of Soviet soil, 362-3

mutual aid with Czechoslovakia, 353

Norwegian King Haakon VII, sym-
pathy on German invasion of, 492

Poland:

contentious matters with, 478, 485

frontiers, violation of (1939), 460

mutual aid agreement with, 361

non-recognition of territorial changes
since Aug 1939, 460

restoration of territories seized by,
458

treaties, violation of, 458

political organization, post-war, 356-7

position of, in post-war Europe, 432

Queen Wilhelmina's broadcast con-
demning German invasion of, 508-
9

self-determination of nations, prin-
ciple of, accepted, 356

Slav states, relations with, post-war,
545

Soviet-German treaties of 1939, repu-
diation of, 354-5

system, strength of, 358

territorial integrity of nations, prin-
ciple of, accepted, 356

treaty of mutual aid with United
Kingdom, 365

Turkey, declaration to, with United
Kingdom, 208

United Kingdom:

mutual aid agreement with, 373

treaty of alliance with, May 26,
1942, 235

speech of Sikorski on, 476-8

treaty with United Kingdom and
Iran, 224

U. S. friendship with, 375-6

war crimes of Axis Powers, 366-71

war criminals:

Extraordinary State Committee for
Investigation of German Fascist

Invaders, decree on formation of,
369-71

war of extermination against Ger-
many, 359

United Kingdom, 155-278 (*see also*
subject headings and individuals).

agreements:

with U S S R, 208

with U S, 10, 68

Albania, independence of, 546-7

Belgium, agreement on use of Belgian
armed forces, 529

China, relinquishment of extraterrito-
rial rights in, 263

churches of, statements on peace aims,
639-46

Churchill's visit to Moscow, 374

Czechoslovak frontiers, repudiation of
Munich and subsequent changes in,
410, 436-7

Czechoslovakia, recognition of, 410

- declaration of unity of purpose with
 France, 179
 Ethiopia, agreement with, 226
 European security system, participation in, 435
 extraterritoriality in China, relinquishment of, 121
 France, pledge to, 184
 Franco-British Union, proposal for, 185
 Greece, agreement on armed forces, 538
 India, declarations regarding, 278-300
 Jews, declaration condemning German policy of exterminating, 14
 Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 lend-lease agreement with U S, 10, 77
 Madagascar, status of, 231
 moral assets in war, 477
 Munich Agreement, denunciation of, 253
 Munich boundaries, non-recognition of, 410
 Norway, agreement, report on, to liberate from German domination, and employment of Norwegian armed forces, 490-1
 Poland, non-recognition of territorial changes since Aug. 1939, 460
 political parties, 668-86
 reciprocal-aid agreement with U S, 10
 relation of Dominions to, 301
 Soviet attack on Poland, statement on, 159
 treaty with U S S R. and Iran, 224
 Turkey, declaration to, with U S S R., 208
 U S S R
 alliance, Australian reaction to, 320
 mutual aid agreement with, 373
 treaty of May 26, 1942, 235, 476-8
 U S :
 lend-lease agreement
 benefits to U.S., 77
 text, 10
 statement of Pres. Roosevelt, 68
 Wheat Meeting, preamble to draft convention, 13
 United Nations, 1-14 (*see also individual countries*)
 basis for international cooperation, 266, 495
 charter, 134
 collaboration of, 430
 conferences, French participation in, 576
 interchange of ideas among peoples of, 655-6
 Joint Declaration
 statement by Cordell Hull, 66
 text, 1
 Liberal Party of Great Britain on collaboration of, 684-6
 nucleus for world organization, 88, 91, 140, 432
 United States, 15-154 (*see also subject headings and individuals*)
 Canada.
 Joint Economic Committees, 41
 Ogdensburg Agreement, 29, 42
 post-war economic committees, 144
 China, relations with, 392-6
 chronology, 15-18
 European reconstruction, participation in, 445
 foreign policy, fundamental principles of, 19, 31, 57, 63
 Inter-Allied Meetings, interest in, 216
 Japan, Outline of Proposed Basis for Agreement with, 57
 Jews, declaration condemning German policy of exterminating, 14
 Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 Lend-Lease Act, 34
 lend-lease agreements *See that title*.
 membership in future world organization, importance of, 345
 obligation to promote peace, 631
 Roosevelt, Franklin D. *See that title*
 Wheat Meeting, preamble to draft convention, 13
 Uruguay
 defense of hemisphere, 607
 Nazism, repudiation of, 607

V

- van Kleffens *See* Kleffens, Eelco N van
 van Mook, Hubertus J. *See* Mook, Hubertus J. van
 Vargas, Getulio, American continental solidarity, 606
 Vatican, The, 610-26:
 Pope Pius XII
 Christmas Message (1939), 613-14
 Christmas Message (1940), 615-17

- Pope Pius XII — *Continued*
 Christmas Message (1941), 621-3
 Christmas Message (1942), 626
 encyclical letter on the *Function of the State in the Modern World*, 610-12
 letter to Pres Roosevelt, 614-15
 plea to warring nations, 623-5
Rerum Novarum of Pope Leo XIII, 50th anniversary broadcast, 617-21
 Venezuela, pledge to respect obligations, 605-6
 Versailles Treaty, weakness of, 454
- W
- Wallace, Henry A.
 democratic aims of Soviet Russia and the U S , 132
 people's revolution, 79
 reconstruction, America's role in, 147
- War
 abolition of, as political instrument, 425, 630
 costs of, allocation of, 93
 War crimes, punishment of:
 Attlee, Clement R , 217
 Belgian statement on, 527-8
 Churchill, Winston, 256
 Commission for the Investigation of, 260
 Czechoslovak demands, 441
 decree by Polish Govt , 480
 Eden, Anthony, 257, 273
 Extraordinary State Committee of U S S R for Investigation of, 369-71
 Netherlands assistance in, 516
 responsibility of German people for Norwegian crimes, 500
 Simon, Viscount, 260
 Soviet statement on, 366-9
 Stassen, Harold E , 664
 Wallace, Henry A , 150
 Welles, Sumner, 88
- Washington Conference on Limitation and Reduction of Armament, 402
- Welles, Sumner
 American responsibility in post-war world, 30
 economic reconstruction, role of lend-lease in, 95
 Four Freedoms, achievement of, 142
 liberal trade policies as basis for durable peace, 29, 51
 Poland, non-recognition of territorial changes since Aug 1939, 460
 pre-armistice agreements between United Nations, 140
 raw materials, equal access to, 114
 security as goal in post-war world, 42
 trade, liberal, 116
 world organization, 88
- Western civilization, war for, 485
- Western Hemisphere.
 defense of, 594-5
 economic mobilization, 582-3
 solidarity, 24, 25, 34, 40, 89
- Wheat Meeting, draft convention, preamble, 13
- Wilhelmina, Queen of the Netherlands.
 aggression, safety from, 520
 armed forces, demobilization of, problem of, 519
 Atlantic Charter, adherence to, principles of, 515, 519, 522
 balance between individual and community, 518
 broadcast to Holland and Netherlands Empire, 507
 broadcast to people of Netherlands, 506-7
 citizen, safeguarding of, from undue interference from government, 518
 community rights, 518
 conference, post-war, on status of overseas territories, 515
 duties to contribute to security and economic life of world, 520
 enemies, treatment of, 520
 Four Freedoms, realization of, 519
 free institutions, development of, 514
 freedom for the Netherlands, 506-7
 fundamental convictions, 517-19
 German invasion of U S S.R , condemnation of, 508-9
 Germany, treatment of, 520
 Government declaration, Jan 27, 1942 on conference of entire Kingdom, 512, 521
 independence, fight for, 507
 international cooperation only salvation, 520
 international economic planning, 515
 joint consultation on Kingdom and its parts, 521

- Kingdom, reconstruction of, post-war, 521-3
- lend-lease agreement with U S , 515
- liberty, freedom of conscience and religion, survival of, 507
- message to *New York Herald Tribune* Forum on problems of post-war world, 517-20
- Nazism, denunciation of, 509
- Netherlands Indies
 - bi-political unit, formation of, 518
 - democracy, development of, 514, 522
- occupied countries, rehabilitation of, 519
- peace aims, 515
- people, responsibility of, 518
- private rights, 518
- public opinion essential to peace, 518
- racial equality, 522
- revenge, barrenness of, 520
- speech before U S. Congress, 514-15
- unity for victory, 515
- war aims, 515
- Willkie, Wendell L.
 - Allied nations, purposes of, 657-8
 - American Revolution, idea behind the, 654
 - Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, 659
 - Chiang K'ai-shek's message to America, 659
 - China's relation to the war, 656-7
 - colonial peoples, future administration of, 657
 - common purposes of United Nations, 659
 - equality of peoples, 647
 - exploitation of Eastern peoples, end to, 653
 - foundations of secure peace, 653
 - Four Freedoms, 657
 - Fourteen Points of Woodrow Wilson, 654
 - global peace, 652
 - ideas, role of, 654-5
 - imperialism, international, 649
 - isolationism of American leaders, 648-9
 - institutions, international, in post-war, 651
 - interchange of ideas among United Nations peoples, 655-6
 - interdependence of peoples, 651, 653
 - international cooperation, necessity for, 648
 - League of Nations, 654
 - liberty of justice for Eastern peoples, 653
 - mankind on the march, 653
 - new world society, creation of, 653
 - participation of U S in post-war organization, 653
 - peoples' war for liberation, 660
 - political and economic cooperation, 651
 - principles for basis of peace, agreement with Allies on, 655
 - raw materials, access to, 657-8
 - report to people after return from Middle East, Russia and China, 652
 - role of U S in post-war world, 652
 - Soviet Russia
 - contribution to war, 656, 658-60
 - need of cooperation of U S. with, 660
 - three-point program on war aims, 651
 - totalitarianism, destruction of, 651
 - "win the peace" during the war, 655, 660
- Wilson, Woodrow, statement on purpose of World War I, 654
- Winant, John G.
 - colonial peoples, treatment of, 107
 - political and economic collaboration, 60
 - preservation of traditions of freedom, 117
 - social objectives, 90
- Wood, Sir Kingsley, financial and economic controls, 228
- World commonwealth, relation to regional confederation, 429
- World Confederation of International Groupments, 337
- World court *See* International court of justice
- World Economic Cooperation, Washington Conference on, 628
- World organization.
 - British Labor Party plan for, 672, 675-6
 - British Liberal Party, resolution on, 684-6
 - Eden, Anthony, 268
 - formation of, during war period, 399
 - functions and forms, 632
 - Halifax, Lord, 197
 - Hull, Cordell, 99
 - Lothian, Lord, 172-3
 - model for, 452, 456

World organization — *Continued*

- Nash, Walter, 328-33
- Simon, Viscount, 254
- Smuts, Field Marshal J. C., 343-8
- Stassen, Harold E., statement of, 665
- system of, 627
- United Nations as nucleus of, 140
- Welles, Sumner, 88
- World Peace Conference
 - attitude of Czechoslovakia toward, 444
 - convocation, time of, 445
- World War II, "what we are fighting for," 430-2
- Wunsz King, war criminals, punishment of, 387

X Y Z

- York, Archbishop of, Temple, Most Rev William, Malvern Conference conclusions, 643
- Youth:
 - role of, in post-war world, 110
 - in Germany, 200
- Yugoslavia, 547-57:
 - agreement with Greece, statement of Anthony Eden on, 226
 - Balkan Union, agreement with Greece on, 535-8
 - Bulgaria, aggressive action against, 551-2
 - Cabinet statement on European post-war organization, 552-3
 - chronology, 547-8
 - Czechoslovakia, pledge of friendship with, 422
 - federation of all racial groups in, 557
 - German war crimes, inter-Allied declaration, 7
 - Jews, declaration condemning German policy of exterminating, 14
 - Joint Declaration by United Nations, 1
 - joint declaration on post-war reconstruction at I.L.O. Conference, 414-15
 - Joint Declaration, with Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Jan. 14, 1942, 8
 - joint statement with U.S., on prosecution of war and a durable peace, 555-6
 - lend-lease agreement with U.S., 10, 556
 - Pavelitch, punishment of, 556
 - political discussions on post-war plans, share in, 552-3
 - pledge of Pres. Roosevelt to restore self-government, 67
 - unity in, need for, 222
- Yugoslav-Turkish union, 408

